THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

Of the making of books about St. John there is no end. If we mention only the names of Temple, Hoskyns, Bultmann, Dodd and Barrett, it will be seen that the last two decades have produced more notable writing on the Fourth Gospel than on any other New Testament book. Most of these, be it noted, are the works of elderly men. It seems to be the rule that, while you may try your prentice hand on this or that book, you do not presume to pronounce on St. John until experience and ripe learning have properly equipped you for the task. Understandably so: for the Fourth Gospel is, above all else, a mature book whose depth and subtlety only discover themselves to long and patient study.

Mournfully enough, the latest book—*St. John's Gospel*,[1] a commentary on St. John by R. H. LIGHTFOOT, is, like that of Hoskyns, a posthumous work. It will shed a new light on LIGHTFOOT for many who may have thought of him primarily as a Synoptic scholar who made too many concessions to radical Form Criticism, and who once in an unfortunate sentence suggested that we could learn little or nothing about the Jesus of history from the first three Gospels. His own pupils knew better; but now many others who read this commentary, edited for the press by C. F. Evans, will rise to a new appreciation of the fine and sensitive scholarship which was LIGHTFOOT'S.

'The purpose of this book,' we read at the beginning, 'is a religious and theological exposition of the text of St. John's Gospel,' and how nobly in the sequel the book fulfills its opening promise! In temper and approach it recalls Hoskyns, but it abounds in insights of its own. In one respect LIGHTFOOT differs from Hoskyns—he writes much better. A certain cloudiness of style—the unkind would say 'obscurity'—marred the Cambridge scholar's work; of this there is nothing in LIGHTFOOT. Each sentence, carefully built and precisely punctuated, comes to us with the crystal clarity of a Newman or a Denney.

A word on the lay-out of the book may be in place before we introduce our readers to some of its insights. The Introduction, which Evans has skilfully patched together from papers left behind, discusses the origin of the Gospel (without coming to any result about the authorship), its text, the relation of the Fourth Gospel to the first three, and the background, before considering St. John's 'portraiture of the Lord.' Then, on the basis of the R.V. text, comes the commentary which consists of both exegesis and notes. An appendix and indexes round off a book of three hundred and sixty-eight pages. The Commentary, LIGHTFOOT tells us, had originally been commissioned as the Clarendon Bible 'John'; but, as it grew under his hand, it soon exceeded the limits laid down by the publishers. We think this matter for regret, for LIGHTFOOT'S work would not only have added another volume to this slow-appearing series, but would have lent much lustre to it. May we express the hope that C. F. Evans, or some other, may still abridge it (both Introduction and notes could stand cutting) so as to enable it to take its place in the series?

Particularizing on the book's merits, let us start from the question, Why did St. John write his Gospel? This question involves another, Did John know the work of the Synoptists? Despite Gardner Smith's valiant effort to prove his ignorance of them, LIGHTFOOT believes that John knew all three. Further, by John's time (towards the end of the first century) they were so well established in the Church as to exclude any theory that St. John set himself to supersede them. The question was: Were they adequate to meet the needs of the time? It was a time when the Lord was being worshipped even more by Gentile than by Jewish Christians in the little churches fast taking root in the larger cities of the Roman Empire between Jerusalem and Rome. For all their merits, the Synoptics, with their portrayal of Jesus as the Jewish Messiah, could hardly supply the answers to the questions now being asked. What precisely was the place of the Lord Jesus in the ways of God with men? What was the relation between His Coming as Jesus of Nazareth and His Return as the Son of man? Above all, how did the Lord remain a living force among men and the fountain head of all true and vital religion? These were big and important questions, and St. John gave them definitive answers. He wrote to persuade men that this Jesus, whom the Synoptists had set

[1] Oxford University Press; 30s. net.

forth essentially as the Messiah of Jewish hope, was the final revelation of God's saving purpose for men. Therefore the answer to the question from which we began is that John's purpose was neither to supplement nor to supersede the Synoptics, but to draw out the true significance of the original events. Consider the Fourth Gospel in isolation, says LIGHTFOOT, and it remains a riddle ; consider it as the crown and completion of our Gospel records, and it falls forthwith into place. St. John is essentially the *interpreter* of the Synoptists. There are more kinds of truth than mere truth to fact. If it is this only which we seek, we shall go, as a rule, to the first three Gospels. But if our quest is for truth of meaning, for the right interpretation to be put on the historical facts, then it is to St. John that we must go. His Gospel gives wholeness to the fragmentariness of the first three Gospels, and proves itself, as John Calvin saw long ago, their indispensable key.

From this introductory question let us jump now to the end of St. John's Gospel, for further light from LIGHTFOOT. By fairly general consent (Hoskyns was a demurrer) the Evangelist meant to end his Gospel at 20^{31} and ch. 21 is in the nature of an appendix. Why was it added ? The usual answer is that ch. 21 was added to clear up a misunderstanding about the Beloved Disciple. Some word of the Lord had given rise to a belief among the brethren that the Beloved Disciple would not die before the Lord came back. When this Gospel was written, he had died, and this twenty-first chapter, by explaining what the Lord had actually said, aimed to correct the misunderstanding. But was this the only, or even the chief, reason for the appendix ? May not the Evangelist in this chapter have tried to show what rôles the Lord intended two of His chief disciples, Peter and John, to play in His Church ? Earlier in his Gospel the Evangelist has set forth the Beloved Disciple (whom we may take to be John, son of Zebedee) as pre-eminently the apostle of insight. In the Upper Room it is through the Beloved Disciple that Peter makes his approach to the Master. On the first Easter Day it is the Beloved Disciple who first grasps the import of the Empty Tomb. And in this twenty-first chapter, it is this same disciple who, by the Lake of Galilee, is the first to recognize the Risen Lord on the shore. On the other hand, Peter is here commissioned by the Lord to exercise practical oversight of the Lord's flock. Is it not then clear (the Evangelist would say) that the Lord designed very different work for His two apostles ? Peter was to be the apostle of action and administration in the Church ; John, as the man of spiritual insight, was to be the witness and guardian of the Lord's revelation and the truth of the gospel. And such in fact he became by his written word—by the Gospel which has come down to us. If this be so, may we not put our second point alongside the first one, by saying that St. John not only aimed to be the true interpreter of the Church's traditions about Jesus, but that he based his interpretation on the testimony of one whom the Lord Himself intended to be the guardian of His truth ?

Now for a third feature of LIGHTFOOT's treatment of the Gospel. It is a cardinal characteristic of John's method that a ' work ' of Jesus is usually accompanied by a Dominical ' word ' explaining it. The ' work ' normally precedes the ' word.' Thus, in ch. 6 the Feeding of the Multitude is followed by a discourse on the Bread of Life. In ch. 11, however, the ' work ' (namely, the raising of Lazarus) and the ' word ' (' I am the resurrection and the life ') are combined. But in the case of the Farewell Discourses, the ' word ' (chs. 13–17) *precedes* the 'work ' (ch. 18–20) ; for the whole purpose of these discourses is to interpret in advance to the disciples the meaning of the Cross and the Resurrection and Christ's Return. Furthermore, as proof of the careful design and unity of the Gospel, we should note that if chs. 2–12, describing the Public Ministry of the Lord, are simply an expansion of the statement in the Prologue that ' he came unto his own, and his own received him not,' so chs. 13–20 illustrate that other statement in the Prologue which said that ' to as many as received him to them he gave the right to become children of God.'

These three examples, which could easily be increased, will, we hope, give our readers an impression of LIGHTFOOT's deep understanding of the Fourth Gospel. So long has he brooded over its text that the workings of the Evangelist's mind and his thought-connexions seem to become luminous to him. To be sure, sometimes he strikes us as being much too subtle, reading more into the words than we believe the Fourth Evangelist intended. We are not convinced, for example, that in 17^{12} St. John in calling Judas ' the man of perdition ' was inviting his readers to find in him Paul's ' man of sin ' in 2 Th 2^{3}. Nor are we persuaded that John meant his reference to the seamless robe of Christ to symbolize the indivisible unity of believers who form the Body of Christ. On the other hand, there may be more to be said in 19^{15} for translating the Greek ' Hoist him up ! ' thus making the Jews ask unconsciously for the exaltation of Christ. But, take it all in all, this is a profound and noble study of the greatest of the Gospels. LIGHTFOOT's best book was his last one, and we have no hesitation in declaring that it is the best commentary now available on the English text.

The problem of leisure has been attracting more and more attention since the end of the First World War. People are living longer: they are retiring earlier; and even when engaged in gainful employment they are working fewer hours. There is also good reason to expect that these tendencies will not diminish but rather increase, perhaps rapidly, in the near future. Such an increase of leisure raises not one problem but many; yet the solution of them all may be facilitated by nothing so much as a true attitude to work, for what work means to a man determines to a large extent what leisure will mean to him. It cannot be denied that the Church has failed to make the concept of Divine vocation in work meaningful to the great mass of ordinary folk both within and without its own membership; and just for that reason their attitude to work and to leisure is perverted.

In this connexion we direct attention to a thought-provoking article in the summer number of the American Christian Quarterly, *Religion in Life*—'Rethinking the Protestant Doctrine of Vocation,' by Dr. E. Clinton GARDNER. The writer points out that the spiritual impoverishment of our age, its lack of the sense of Divine purpose and Divine calling, issue paradoxically both in the attempt to escape from work and in the attempt to escape into work—the former because work seems meaningless, the latter because leisure seems even more empty and boring. With regard to the latter Dr. GARDNER uses the terms 'work-idolatry' and 'work-anesthesia,' and suggests that while for most people work represents many values including, but by no means limited to, financial gain, yet for many, especially the older section of the population, work is little more than a means of escape from an otherwise empty life.

Faced with this situation, the Protestant doctrine of vocation makes two contributions. On the one hand, it warns modern man that his worship of work as an end in itself is idolatrous, and that he ought to see his work in terms of the ends to be achieved by it, and particularly in the larger context of the Creator's call to all men to participate in the process of meeting genuine human needs. In the second place, and deriving from this, the Protestant doctrine of vocation implies that modern man must be ready to accept a far broader definition of what constitutes work. For too many, perhaps the majority, work has become largely an economic concept, and with the increase of leisure it is a concept which is destined to give significance to a steadily diminishing segment of human life. The Church must challenge both the idea of work as an economic concept and the work-idolatry to which the Church has itself contributed by too narrow an emphasis on work. Place must be found in the idea of work for activities which contribute to the meeting of human needs, whether individual or social, whether domestic, economic, political or spiritual.

Perhaps one might suggest to Dr. GARDNER at this point that work as an economic concept involving personal financial gain is too deeply rooted in the popular mind to be disturbed meantime, and that the end which he has in view could more readily be reached not by broadening the definition of work but by broadening the scope of the term vocation. Let the Church encourage people to believe that whether they are working or not, in the narrow sense of the term, God calls them to be active in contributing to the enrichment of human life in society, it may be in ways that can be thought of as economic or it may be in ways that might be described as spiritual. In any case, in this age when the consumer demands of the world's population can be met with less and less expenditure of time and human energy, we are required to summon men, not only in God's name but in the name of wholesome living, to pay more attention to other needs, less tangible, less material, but more pressing from a psychological point of view, since the way of escape into work-idolatry is going to become closed to the masses for an increasingly large portion of their lives.

There is another aspect of work viewed as participation in the creative purposes of God which needs to be stressed to-day. It was not much noticed by the Reformers, possibly because in their day and until recently most people did not have much chance to choose occupations which they could feel would give full range to their gifts. That did not necessarily make the idea of vocation meaningless for them, for, as John F. Sleeman has put it, there is a vocation of acceptance as well as of choice. Nevertheless in these days when educational facilities are widespread there is a greater opportunity than ever for a vocation of choice, and the Church should urge young people to make a responsible choice of their life-work, warning them against the temptation to develop only those gifts which will tend to greatest security or greatest prestige, and reminding them that the acceptance of the Creator's call to develop the special capacities with which they have been endowed ennobles all forms of work that are undertaken for the glory of God, and rules out any hierarchical scale of values as regards the kind of work performed.

Further, Divine vocation means that men are summoned to participate in the work of redemption as well as of creation, since God is Redeemer as well as Creator. The acceptance of responsible life in community is demanded not only in order that the economic and political needs of society may be effectively met, but also as a condition of meeting man's fundamental spiritual needs. We are, in short, called to work together with God in the freeing men from sin and the consequences of sin. This involves more than the verbal proclamation of the gospel together with the personal practice of a strict ethic. It involves also social concern as a vital part of the impulse to redemption, for there are social structures which largely frustrate any spiritual appeal to the persons subjected to their pressure. Contrasts of extreme wealth and poverty erect barriers to fellowship, and breed on the one side bitterness and on the other self-righteousness and contempt. Poor housing conditions affect the emotional growth of children. The corruption of the moral atmosphere by false standards of success and by dishonesty in advertising and selling constitutes a barrier to the gospel. To help to remove such impediments to salvation falls within the scope of Christian vocation. The Divine command to love summons the Christian, whatever his work in the narrower sense, to participate in the redemption of the social structures of his day, even though he knows that the task will not be completed in his day, and possibly not in history at all. It is a Divine call, and that for him is sufficient motive and warrant.

Further *Expository Problems* will follow those already announced. They are The Final Judgment and Present Justification; The Ascension; The Purpose of the Parables; Evil Powers; The Unforgivable Sin; Man Created in the Image of God; The Cry of Dereliction. The articles are to be written by Principal C. Leslie Mitton, Professor C. F. D. Moule, Professor William Manson, the Rev. D. E. H. Whiteley, the Rev. Owen E. Evans, Dr. H. G. Wood and the Rev. D. H. C. Read.

Short *Religious Education Series* are being considered on 'Historic Methods of Christian Education'; 'Christian Theology and Educational Theory' and 'Catechisms, their Origin, their Use and their Place To-day.' Suggestions are welcomed.

Studies on Philippians, going back to the great Patristic Commentaries and the Commentaries of the Reformation, extracting from them their great sayings and their leading ideas and bringing out their relevance for to-day, will be contributed by Dr. William Barclay.

Professor Nels S. Ferré will write on *Christian Presuppositions for a Creative Culture*, and articles by Dr. C. K. Barrett, which will appear soon, will deal with *Johannine Theology in the Second Century*.

Religious Education

The Church of England and her Children

By the Reverend John G. Williams, M.A., Liverpool

The very first time I was ever present at a service of Holy Communion in the Church of England was on the Sunday after my Confirmation, when I made my first Communion. It was an anxious and disappointing experience. The service was almost completely unfamiliar to me, and so were most of the people taking part, a small company of isolated individuals scattered at random over a wilderness of empty pews; and at the end we drifted off in chill silence to home and breakfast. It was a forbidding introduction for any young person to the Church's chief act of fellowship. It would be hard to imagine anything less like an act of 'Communion' or an expression of *koinonia*.

This grim experience crystallizes what had, until recent years, become a serious weakness in the Church's approach to her younger members, and in many quarters still is. In baptism the child is made a member of the Family of Christ, and the Service of Baptism stresses the truth that Confirmation and Communion are the necessary completion of this privilege. 'Ye are to take care that this child be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed by him, so soon as he can say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and be further instructed in the Church Catechism set forth for that purpose.' This does not assume a very advanced stage of instruction, and it was

clearly the mind of those who compiled the Book of Common Prayer that children should, as a matter of course and as soon as possible, be brought to Confirmation and Communion. That is the purport of the solemn vows undertaken by parents and godparents at the font. Yet thousands of the babies baptized every Sunday at our fonts are never brought to be instructed in the faith. Of those who are, a high proportion come only to a Sunday School, which all too often has only the most tenuous link with the worshipping congregation and may sometimes be in direct competition with it ; and in many other instances children may come to Mattins or Evensong for years, and even reach the point of Confirmation, without ever once being present at the service of Holy Communion, which is the one great focal point of their membership in the Body of Christ.

During the last thirty years the Liturgical Movement (with its stress on the Parish Eucharist) has been attempting to restore the service of Holy Communion to its obviously central place in the worship of the Church ; and this is a thing that has enormous importance also as an educational instrument in the Church's dealing with her children. It works because it is right. No one can dispute that the Holy Communion is the most important act of the Christian community. It is the Lord's own service, expressly instituted and commanded ; the only one held and honoured in common by all Christians. The Book of Common Prayer, following the age-long tradition of Christendom, plainly intends that the Communion should be the chief and central service of every Sunday and holy day. The rubrics after the Nicene Creed are the only place in the Prayer Book where the priest is enjoined to give out notices and banns and to preach a sermon. Quite clearly it is meant to be the service at which as far as possible everybody should be present. The rubrics at the end of the service make it clear that it was also intended to be a service at which as many people as possible should receive Communion. All this underlines the Church's insistence on the Holy Communion as her most important act of worship and one with which children ought to be made familiar from their earliest years. The true picture of the Christian Church at worship is a family of 'young men and maidens, old men and children' praising God together.

In contrast with my own bleak experience of a first Communion (and it is one which many young people are still having to undergo) let me paint a picture—from later and more fortunate experience—of how we may give children a happier approach to the altar, helping them to grow naturally to their full stature as members of the Body of Christ, from baptism onwards. The essential core of this whole approach is some form of Parish Communion at which the whole congregation, young and old, can reasonably be expected to be present.

It all begins with the child's baptism ; and here, as we instruct parents and godparents about the meaning of their promises, we must insist firmly on the fact that what begins in baptism is not properly completed until the child has become a regular communicant. No one should ever be allowed to undertake these solemn commitments without realizing the thoroughly practical implications of them, and they should be presented to sponsors (and, above all, to parents) as a serious challenge to their own integrity. When this is done with sympathy and emphasis, many parents and sponsors, for the sake of the children, may be prevailed upon to seek Confirmation themselves, or to make a new start if they have lapsed. But then the most important thing is to provide them with the kind of setting within which they can be expected to carry out their promises with some hope of success. To come to church themselves and to bring their children with them—that is clearly the ideal ; but have we the kind of services to offer them at which this would be practicable or desirable ? A Parish Communion is the answer.

Where we can provide the right kind of Family Communion the young child might quite well be brought to it from his babyhood. Let me here describe the kind of service which is fast becoming customary in many churches of all persuasions, both Evangelical and Catholic, so that we may examine its value as an educational instrument (for we must recognize the truth that all communal acts of worship are inevitably a medium of teaching, all the time communicating ideas and presuppositions to those taking part). It is a simple Sung Eucharist, with hymns and a brief address, as the chief service on Sunday morning, at which most of the members of the church can be present, and at which as many as possible will be encouraged to make their Communion. Parents are invited to come with their children, even tiny babies, and where possible to sit together as a family. Older children will generally prefer to sit with their friends, but that need not destroy the family atmosphere. Members of the congregation who have no special vocation for work with children may be prevailed upon to sit with children whose parents do not come—even to call for them and bring them and help them to feel at home. When the parents and older people come up to make their Communion they are invited to bring the little ones with them to the altar rail. The toddlers can kneel side by side with them, and there is no reason why a mother should not receive Communion with a baby in her arms. As the priest gives Communion he pauses for a moment to bless the babies and

children, resting his hand for a moment on their heads as he says a simple ' God bless you and keep you always.'

Such a service is not only an exhilarating experience of ' family ' worship at its best ; it is also an impressive means of helping children to find their place naturally in the worshipping life of the Church and of helping adult members of the congregation to recognize their responsibility for every child baptized at the font. As children grow in that setting there will never be a time in their life when they were not acquainted with the Church's chief act of worship. Week by week they will see the altar thronged with communicants ; they will have their own simple share in the great moment of Communion, and they will come to long for the time when they too may receive the sacred bread and wine.

This kind of approach makes a natural use of the child's over-riding desire to be grown-up by allowing him to share in adult worship. It is a psychological error to lay undue stress on a child's immaturity. He may come to associate religion with the limitations of childhood, which provides a reasonable excuse for abandoning it when he gets older. It is much sounder to let him realize that by his baptism he is a privileged member of a community of young and old. This will not mean ignoring his immaturity. The great educational value of the Eucharist is that it is teaching all the time by its very action. It is a *drama*, and is all the more fascinating to children because it provides so many things to watch and do. The actual ' instruction ' at the Eucharist may have the children specially in mind, and will be all the better for being simple, pictorial, and brief, and above all things an integral part of the worship. This kind of address is also more acceptable to most adults. It can be a short exposition of Collect, Epistle or Gospel, or an explanation of some part of the action.

Where a rule of worship at the Eucharist is made a matter of moral obligation (as indeed it should be) the actual service of Holy Communion can be made the basis of all instruction for Confirmation. The Bishop of Warrington has produced an admirable series of Confirmation talks based entirely on the movement of the Eucharist.[1] Confirmation candidates can then be required to begin, as we expect them to continue, by being regularly present at the service every Sunday during their preparation—a rule impossible to insist on if the only celebration is at an early hour with a mere handful of occasional communicants, but quite simple if the Eucharist is the chief service of Sunday morning with the whole family present.

This has been a mere sketch of what is, in fact, proving a most powerful approach to the children of the Church. The value of it is that, besides being in harmony with the age-long practice of Christendom, it is rooted in sound educational principles. It will need adapting to the varying needs of parishes, but the guiding principles remain inviolate. In the rapidly changing conditions of the present time this is likely to prove more and more to be the most effective way of grafting our young members securely into the Body of Christ's Church.

[1] These are available from *The Children's Council*, 69 Great Peters Street, London, S.W.1.

Literature

CANAANITE MYTHS AND LEGENDS

The need of a handy edition of the poetical texts preserved on the tablets from Ras Shamra, the ancient Ugarit, which has long been felt, has now been handsomely met by the publication of Professor G. R. Driver's edition of these texts—*Canaanite Myths and Legends* (' Old Testament Studies ' No. 3 [T. and T. Clark ; 25s. net]).

The main part of the edition, which is based upon lectures given by the editor over a period of ten years, is devoted to text and translation. The original texts of the seven poems—Keret, Aqhat, Rephaim, Hadad, Baal, Shachar and Shalim, and Nikkal and the Kathirat—are given in transliteration, with the translation opposite, variant readings and other critical and explanatory foot notes appearing below. The introduction deals with the discovery of the tablets, and with the analysis and interpretation of the texts. An extensive, but not exhaustive, bibliography, arranged conveniently under different headings, is supplied, and there is a table showing the order of the tablets. Some observations on philology and grammar, brief, but much to the point, and a full glossary are included, and there is an index of Biblical references.

Students of the Semitic languages will find this edition immensely informative and suggestive, while those whose interest lies mainly in the contribution which these poems make to the

elucidation of the Old Testament are served no less well. They can now study the poems in an up-to-date translation, and they will be greatly helped in their understanding of them by the editor's analysis and interpretation of them. They will, too, find their attention drawn throughout to parallelisms of thought and phraseology with the Old Testament. Contrasts, as well as correspondences, are clearly brought out. For example, El's order to Keret to enrol in his army the newly married husband contrasts with Dt 24^5. On the other hand, Danel's cursing of an unknown murderer and of the cities nearest the scene of the crime recalls Dt $21^{1ff.}$, and the seven years drought, which followed the murder of Aqhat, the sickness of Keret, and other events, bring to mind passages like Gn $41^{26ff.}$ and 2 $K8^{1ff.}$. Very acute is the application of the covering by Anat of her new-born offspring with two coverings to the elucidation of Pr 31^{21}, where *shanim* 'scarlet' of the Massoretic Text is read *shenaim* 'two' by the Septuagint and Vulgate. These are but stray examples. Points of contact with the Old Testament may be found on almost every page of the translation.

Of this edition it may truly be said that it is all that an edition should be. Yet the editor would be the last to claim anything like finality for it. He points out, for example, that the order in which he has arranged the poems is largely conjectural, owing to the loss of most of the titles and catchlines, and that it may indeed be wrong. The three tablets containing the myth of the Rephaim are particularly difficult to place in the cycle of myths. Again, the editor has included in the glossary a certain number of alternative words, readings and interpretations, so that the reader may make his choice among them. Yet it is throughout evident that the editor has spared no pains to search the work of his predecessors in this field of study and to achieve the highest degree of accuracy possible in the present state of knowledge. It is greatly to be hoped, as the editor himself hopes, that this edition, which is a monument of labour and learning, will stimulate others—students of mythology and religion as well as of the Old Testament and the Semitic languages—to take up the study of these difficult texts and contribute to the solution of the many problems which still remain.

D. Winton Thomas

BIBLICAL RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

Lectures which Professor Paul Tillich gave at the University of Virginia in 1951 have now been published under the title *Biblical Religion and the Search for Ultimate Reality* (Nisbet; 8s. 6d. net). The subject dealt with is a difficult one, and here it is dealt with in relative brevity, for the book is a slim volume of only eighty-five pages. But the attention which Dr. Tillich gives to it also in his larger writings is evidence of the importance it has for his standpoint as a systematic theologian. Must theology, he asks, in dealing with the concrete imagery of the Biblical language and that to which it witnesses, refrain from making use of the terms and concepts of philosophy? The right answer would appear to be Yes, for the Biblical and the philosophical (the ontological) represent very contrasted and conflicting dimensions. A century ago this was the answer preferred passionately by Kierkegaard and in our time Barth has approved of it. What must be asserted is the radical dissociation of Biblical faith (of Christianity) and philosophy. There is no way of approach to any kind of synthesis except at the risk of making insecure that which is most sacred and of infinite concern for the believer. But this answer is not acceptable to Dr. Tillich. It fails to do what it is the duty of theology to do, to take philosophy seriously. For the religious and the ontological realities have an ultimate unity and a profound interdependence. As he puts it tersely in his concluding chapter: '*Against* Pascal I say, The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and the God of the philosophers is the same God.'

It is a sign of Dr. Tillich's respect for the difficulties inherent in any attempt at synthesis that he devotes the larger part of his book to a description of the contrast between Biblical religion and ontology. The centre of the anti-ontological bias of Biblical religion is its personalism, and this in some of its doctrinal expressions and its understanding of man is presented vividly in Dr. Tillich's exposition. Nevertheless he claims that the Biblical symbols drive inescapably to an ontological question. Scripture is rooted in the I-Thou character of the religious relation, yet it preserves a deep feeling for the transpersonal mystery and power of the Divine. So when the philosopher speaks of the Divine as being (or the power of being) he does not deny necessarily the revelatory experiences. The ontological need not mean the abstract or the static; it can be dynamic and in so far as it is that it can aid with conceptual forms the dramatic historical ways of apprehending God as life and love and spirit which are the Biblical modes of utterance. There is a basis on which ontology and Biblical religion find each other, and theology must not refuse the task, the infinite task, of correlation. It is right to add to this description of Dr. Tillich's thesis his own concluding reminder: 'The ontological question is implied in the question of salvation but there is no saving ontology.' What comes before us in all this readable and powerful writing is an alternative both to the exclusive Biblicism of much contemporary theology

and to a philosophical rationalism which leaves unexplored the deeper levels of the human spirit.

J. Macleod

BARTH'S 'CHURCH DOGMATICS'

In his Preface to Dr. Otto Weber's 'Introductory Report' on the first six half-volumes of his *Church Dogmatics* Dr. Barth writes that any one who wishes to speak about him should at least have read him, and that 'if he is a serious person and not a journalist,' he should have read him 'completely.' It is to be feared that most of those who have discussed Barth and Barthianism in this country would by that test have to be classed as journalists; for there can be few to whom the whole of the *Kirchliche Dogmatik* has been accessible in the original, and only the first half-volume which was translated twenty-one years ago by Professor G. T. Thomson, has hitherto been available in English. It is good news that the second half-volume—*Church Dogmatics*, I: *The Doctrine of the Word of God*, Part 2 (T. and T. Clark; 50s. net)—just issued heralds the appearance at much shorter intervals of the rest of the work, on which a team of translators is engaged under the joint editorship of Dr. G. W. Bromiley and Professor T. F. Torrance. We shall still have to wait some years before we can all hope to qualify as fully serious persons, but in the meantime there is plenty to get on with in the eight hundred and eighty-four closely packed pages of the present book.

The greater part of the translation was made by Professor Thomson, the rest by Dr. Harold Knight, and both translators and editors are to be congratulated on the way in which they have managed to turn Barth's involved and difficult German into intelligible if not always elegant English. Of the three chapters it contains, the first takes up the theme of 'the revelation of God' that was begun in its predecessor, and deals with 'the incarnation of the Word' and 'the outpouring of the Holy Spirit,' which are described respectively as the objective and the subjective 'reality and possibility' of revelation. The next two speak in turn of the doctrine of Holy Scripture and the proclamation of the Church, which are understood as witnesses to the revelation and means by which God Himself speaks His revealing Word—when and where He will. In working out his argument, Dr. Barth lays under contribution—often in order to set them right—a host of Fathers, Schoolmen, Reformers, post-Reformation and modern theologians, and there may be some readers who will wonder whether he can have read them all quite 'completely.' But no one who really grapples with him will fail to be impressed by the vistas he opens up, or to benefit from the stimulating, provocative, sometimes irritating, presentation of his case. He is a giant among theologians, the extent of whose influence alone would make it impossible to ignore him, even if with Professor Wingren (in a penetrating criticism published half a dozen years ago in 'The London Quarterly Review') we think he attempts to get at truth by standing error on its head. Dogmatic as he can be, he does not equate his *Church Dogmatics* (as some of his disciples appear to do) with Holy Writ, or imagine that the future of the Church depends upon our all becoming Barthians. (Indeed, he is reported to have said that he is no Barthian himself.) The spirit of his work is well illustrated by the quotation from Luther which he puts 'in place of a Foreword,' and which he would certainly wish us to take to heart. It begins: 'It is not we who can sustain the Church, nor was it our forefathers, nor will it be our descendants. It was and is and will be the One who says: "I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."' We shall not mistake the author's intention if we take the whole book as essentially—to use one of his favourite words—a 'pointer' to that One.

Philip S. Watson

DAILY BIBLE STUDIES

A few years ago the Rev. William Barclay, B.D., D.D., Lecturer in New Testament Language and Literature in the University of Glasgow, was asked to prepare a set of Daily Bible Studies on Acts for the Church of Scotland. They received such an appreciative welcome that he went on to write similar studies on St. Mark. These whetted still further readers' appetites, so that now the author is planning to write similar studies on the whole of the New Testament.

The first two studies have now been made available in book form by the Saint Andrew Press. *The Acts of the Apostles* (213 pp.) costs 10s. 6d. (paper covers 4s. 6d.) net and *The Gospel of Mark* (390 pp.) 12s. 6d. (paper covers 5s. 6d.) net. We heartily congratulate Dr. Barclay and the Saint Andrew Press on making these books, already of proved value, available at inexpensive charges. They have already stimulated interest in the New Testament and enriched the lives of many, and we commend them most cordially to those who are not already aware of them.

The fact that the second volume is longer than the first, though based on a shorter New Testament book, suggests that Dr. Barclay has warmed to his task. One has the impression also that in the second volume he increasingly has in mind not only the devotional reader, eager to learn for himself what the New Testament has to say, but also

the Christian leader who finds himself with the responsibility of interpreting and expounding it to others, or even preaching on it in sequence. At any rate, preachers, class leaders and leaders of Young People's Fellowships will find here just the material they need for their work. There are clear scholarly notes on difficult points, such as demons, leprosy, the mystery religions, the Jewish Feasts, the Didache and the Kerygma, but what is still more impressive is the discerning and orderly elucidation of the spiritual significance for to-day of the contents of the New Testament. There is also an astonishing wealth of illustration and apt quotation.

Dr. Barclay himself seems to be free from any noticeable allegiance to any particular school of theological thought, and this makes him all the better suited for this particular task. Some will protest against his definition of the Kingdom of Heaven as 'a society upon earth in which God's will is as perfectly done in earth as it is in heaven.' On the other hand, there may be others who will complain that he has not dealt more explicitly with the historicity of the so-called Nature-miracles. But a writer of such a series cannot do everything and cannot please everybody.

These books are not meant to enable students to pass examinations at Universities; they are for use in the Church, for the work of the Church. From now on, if any minister or lay leader asks me to recommend a book on Acts or Mark, to help him in a class of Bible Study and exposition, my answer will undoubtedly be: 'Try William Barclay.'

C. Leslie Mitton

UNDER THE CROSS

'We must hold firmly to the necessity of an initial careful and critical consideration of the relevant Biblical material.' So writes Mr. Neville Clark towards the end of his study in Biblical Theology, *An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments* (S.C.M.; 8s. net). It is one of the great merits of the book that he has done so in the first six chapters before pressing on to the theological conclusion of the final chapter: 'Only, then, by the maintenance in tension of the three "moments" of salvation can the fullness of the New Testament theological witness be preserved. The line runs from Calvary through baptism to the parousia; and each event in some sense contains within it the fullness of man's redemption. At Calvary we were redeemed; at baptism we are redeemed; at the parousia we shall be redeemed.' Another merit is the awareness of the dangers attending contemporary discussions on the sacraments; in particular, the tendency to consider Baptism and the Eucharist in separation and without reference to each other. Mr. Clark deplores the tradition which relates the one to the Holy Spirit and the other to the Risen Christ. All in all this study is a very sound argument for the necessity of setting the sacraments together within the wholeness of the Christian Faith.

The fact that the S.C.M. Press has given three of the first seventeen 'Studies in Biblical Theology' to the sacraments is indicative of their place in present-day thinking. Mr. Clark gives evidence both in the text and in copious footnotes that he is familiar with a wide range of writing. From this he has succeeded in compressing a considerable body of detail into small, and readable compass. Indeed, this volume may serve well as an introduction to the many other scholars on whom he has drawn, but making, at many points, pertinent comment and criticism. More than once he is able to show that conclusions have been drawn beyond what the evidence can bear. We can warmly commend the book as an admirable survey which at once sums up, evaluates, and advances the current debate on the sacraments. The reader will find very useful a select bibliography which refers to important articles as well as to books.

Again and again, Mr. Clark speaks of both the sacraments standing under the Cross. It is a phrase that can so easily become a cliché. Not that Mr. Clark is ever in danger of making it so, but he would be the first to acknowledge that his Biblical arguments are best read on the background of the worshipping and suffering Church. This background is poignantly drawn by the Rev. J. B. Phillips in *The Church under the Cross* (Highway Press; 8s. 6d. net). He records that, as soon as he had finished his recent translation of the Acts, he accepted an invitation from the Church Missionary Society to write this book on the basis of letters and reports from missionaries at work in the Young Churches overseas. He found the similarity between the two tasks more than verbal. He had, and he communicates in his pages, the clear sense of the same moving of the Spirit—and that, having made full and honest allowance for much of failure and frustration.

In all ages, and in our own, the Church moves forward only when under the Cross. What this means is set out under nine themes and with factual evidence of the work, witness, and worship of the Younger Churches. It will be apparent even to those who have not been there that the story is wholly authentic. In this, as in so much else, Mr. Phillips has done great service for the Young Churches. [It may be interjected here that the publication of his *Letters to Young Churches* in Collins' Fontana Books at 2s. 6d. net has made it available to many who could not afford the original edition.] Of his service to the home

Church many have written. It is fitting that one recently returned from a Young Church should venture to express the wider gratitude and even to suggest that, in the providence of God, the frustration of Mr. Phillips' early desire to go overseas has worked out to the good of all the Churches.

MARCUS WARD

KIERKEGAARD

Dr. T. H. Croxall has made himself the best known of English expositors of Kierkegaard. Most of the translations have come to us from the other side of the Atlantic, and some of the work has been hasty. Knowledge of Danish has been rare among us; and the German and French champions of Kierkegaard as the leader or founder of existentialism have been more interested in discovering what they thought to be anticipations of their own opinions than in the retiring, puzzling Dane himself. Nor have they ever recognised that Kierkegaard was, first and foremost, a Christian. This Dr. Croxall has effectively pointed out; and he has set himself to explain Kierkegaard in his own original and deliberate fashion.

In his latest book, *Kierkegaard Commentary* (Nisbet; 25s. net), he has had in mind both beginners in Kierkegaard studies and advanced scholars. The bulk of the book, however, demands considerably more knowledge of Kierkegaard than is summed up in the six outstanding aspects of his life as referred to in the Introduction. The Regine episode is touched on very lightly, though it is felt to have its importance for nearly all Kierkegaard's writing. The controversy with Bishop Martensen is illustrated by a long statement from the Bishop, but no attempt is made at a critical verdict. The attack of the *Corsair*, an event which shook Kierkegaard painfully, is no more than alluded to.

The reader who is familiar with Kierkegaard will be able to supply the missing details for himself; and what he will appreciate will be the discussion, now of subjects with which Kierkegaard struggled all through his life, now of outstanding books. The 'commentary,' however, is neither on subjects nor on books, but on the man himself. The three 'stages' in life, Dr. Croxall shows, are logical rather than chronological. Kierkegaard, a religious man from the start, never surrendered his interest in aesthetics or ethics; but he chose to expound his views by means of a 'marionette theatre' of pseudonymous authors, nineteen in all (duly marshalled in an appendix). Here Dr. Croxall might have done more for us. For the 'caste' has never been properly described, and, when Dr. Croxall is dealing with Victor Eremita or Judge Williams, it is not easy to distinguish between Dr. Croxall on each of these and the rest, from Dr. Croxall on Kierkegaard himself, or to tell when Dr. Croxall is giving us his own opinions about it all.

To summarize the works of so voluminous a writer in a few pages, with long quotations, is all but impossible. But there emerges a picture, drawn by a whole-hearted advocate of the intrepid and solitary searcher for truth, with his constant cries of 'choose!' 'leap!' and 'act for yourself!' He was as startling and puck-like as Chesterton, as ruthless in boring to the very centre of an emotion as Dostoievsky; hurling at us one paradox, as he called it, after another—an 'either/or' at whose root lay an 'or both'; a true wrestling Jacob, as Dr. Croxall in this valuable work has depicted him.

To restore a balance, however, which might easily be lost, Dr. Croxall has at the same time given us a second work—*Meditations from Kierkegaard* (Nisbet; 12s. 6d. net). This is really a devotional anthology. Dr. Croxall has picked out a series of passages, both in the published works and in the as yet unpublished papers, which have obvious references to Biblical texts. The text, whether a single verse or a portion of a chapter, is furnished with one or more 'meditations,' followed in nearly every instance by a 'prayer,' generally a petition, but sometimes a colloquy or (and here Kierkegaard is not alone) an instruction to the Almighty. References are given on a rather complicated system. Few will be likely to make use of these; and not all will at once recognise (to use Kierkegaard's own word) their 'edifying' character. But they reveal the underlying seriousness of the man whose life-long desire, to discover what it was to be really a Christian, Dr. Croxall has done so much in these two volumes to illumine.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

There is an abundance of sermonic literature dealing with Scriptural characters. Can anything fresh be said about them, or any new lesson applicable to our times be drawn from them? Well, from a very able preacher, with a wide popularity in America and who already has published a long list of books of sermons, the Rev. Dr. Clovis G. Chappell, comes *Meet These Men* (Abingdon Press; $2.00). It contains sermons on fourteen characters. Each has an intriguing title. St. Paul is 'the man who was independent'; Jacob, 'the man who was a convinced crook'; Samuel, 'the man who refused to be fired'; Onesimus, 'the man who was no good', and so on. The treatment is vigorous, and every item is well illustrated from poetry or from the author's personal experience. Only once is there what seems to us something too fanciful—when Lot is promoted to be Mayor of Sodom.

The Communist Revolution in China, one authority informs us, is the latest of numerous instances in the history of that country of political change effected by the alliance of peasant and intellectual. We could not hope for a better guide to what prepared the way for Marxism among Chinese intellectuals than Father O. Brière's *Fifty Years of Chinese Philosophy 1898–1950*, translated by Dr. Laurence G. Thompson (Allen and Unwin; 21s. net). The publishers are to be commended for having made it available. We are shown the fusion of Western and Chinese ideas, with some writers inclining to one of these rather than the other, the attack on Confucius in the second decade of the century, the conflict between the champions of science and those of philosophy, and the steady drift through it all towards materialism and Marxism. A full bibliography enhances the value of the book. One is left with the regret that amid so much Western influence there is scarcely any trace of the impact of Christianity. Even ethics is discredited in some circles and can only secure a hearing by calling itself 'philosophy of life'!

Former students and friends of the late Very Rev. Professor Daniel Lamont, D.D., of New College, Edinburgh, will welcome and prize a book which has been issued—*Studies in the Johannine Writings* (James Clarke; 10s. 6d. net). The studies are Dr. Lamont's lectures and in themselves are well worth posthumous publication. The Very Rev. Hugh Watt, D.D., contributes a Foreword; and an excellent memoir of Lamont is given by the Rev. George R. Logan, B.D., Ph.D., who is the present occupant of Dr. Lamont's former pulpit in Helensburgh. The book contains also a sermon preached by Lamont at Oslo in 1936 at the Twelfth World's Sunday School Convention.

The Rev. Thomas M. Donn, M.A., Parish Minister of Duthil, Inverness-shire, has written a small book on *The Sacrament of Reconciliation* (Leslie Press; 7s. 6d. net). Mr. Donn is a representative of the section within the Church of Scotland who fear ritualistic doctrine and practice, and their views deserve respect. Mr. Donn's topic is the very large one of the Lord's Supper, which he holds to be the Sacrament not of Propitiation but of Reconciliation. He writes for 'the general reader,' for whom we fear the little book is packed much too full with varying anti-sacramentalist discussions. There is much that is good and well said. One sentence must be modified if the booklet is reprinted—'The Reformed Church has always practised and believed in intercommunion as the duty of all Christian Churches' (p. 62). Alas! no statement could well be further from the truth.

A book of sermons by Dr. F. A. Cockin, Bishop of Bristol, arouses anticipations of good things, and these are not disappointed when one peruses *Faith and Work* (Mowbray; 8s. 6d. net). This title suggests the nature of the two series of sermons which make up the book. The first and longer series seeks to make the great themes—Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrection, The Holy Spirit, Judgment—intelligible to people unfamiliar with the traditional language of the Church and perhaps none too sure of the relevance of the faith. The second attempts to relate these fundamental truths to the working life of ordinary folk. Both are successful, especially the former.

Any young minister who wishes to preach 'teaching' or doctrinal sermons, but fears that he cannot make them interesting to his congregation should read this book and see how it can be done.

Brother of the Red Hand, by Mr. Reginald Woods (Salvationist Publishing and Supplies; 2s. 6d. net), is the story of Darkie Hutton, who in his early days was inveigled into crime, who became leader of the Brothers of the Red Hand, and who was an associate of the notorious Charles Peace, and who in the end, through the Salvation Army, found Christ, and became a witness of what Christ had done for his soul. This is a book simply and vividly written, and it tells a story which is still another proof that the saving power of Christ is as strong as ever it was.

Letters on Pacifism, by John Ferguson and Ian Pitt-Watson (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), can be highly commended. This is serious discussion without facile quotation of texts or scoring of debating points. The two authors, writing as Christians, remain divided in judgment at the end. The one sees a pacifist witness as clearly the will of God for him; the other is inclined to hold that the fullness of the truth has eluded them both. While not accepting the pacifist position he is able not merely to respect his correspondent's convictions but also to thank God for them. Would that all arguments on this topic were on the same Christian level!

Books on New Testament background are steadily in demand, and for that alone we see a career of usefulness before *Publicans and Sinners*, by the Rev. Canon H. G. G. Herklots (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net). There is more than that, however, in this study of the ministry of Jesus, for the author contrives to make incident after incident in the Gospels fresh and suggestive, taking as his guiding thread our Lord's truly revolutionary attitude to failures and foreigners so generally neglected or despised. We commend this book warmly to day school and Sunday school teachers, and, indeed, to all who 'would see Jesus.'

The Christian View of Nature

By the Reverend W. David Stacey, M.A., Eastbourne

No part of the Christian revelation is more obscure than the Christian view of Nature. The preacher must cover this ground at his Harvest Festival and be ready to reason with the Nature-lover who finds, or claims to find, God in the open air, but he cannot always speak with confidence. Part of the problem is the speculative nature of the subject, and part, that the *Systematiker* has been reluctant to deal with it. The purpose of this article is to outline the Biblical view.

Outside the Christian faith, the variation is limitless. Thomas Hardy was impressed with the cruelty and ineffectiveness of Nature. For him the law of Nature was its utter lawlessness. He found the grim struggle of the forest with the theme, 'kill to live and live to die,' bewildering and appalling.[1] At the other extreme, Stoics of every kind have found their rest in accepting Nature and its inexorable regularity as the eternal verity. Spinoza could identify God and Nature, and the forest that repelled Hardy was for Wordsworth:

> The anchor of my purest thoughts, the nurse,
> The guide, the guardian of my heart, and soul
> Of all my moral being.[2]

A similar confusion exists among Christians. There are those who have held that the revelation of God in Nature is explicit and unambiguous, that 'every prospect pleases, and only man is vile,' and that the ways of Nature are 'the direct ways of His providence undisturbed by the evil deeds of men or demons.'[3] And there are others who find that Nature so veils God that they look elsewhere for their inspiration. 'They seek to find their rest in Nature and in History. But instead, with fatal necessity, they discover everywhere—their own unquiet.'[4] Let us begin by setting out the facts that are generally recognized.

1. *Nature may reveal God.* Hardy's thoroughgoing pessimism is not true to Christian experience. A deluge of texts and authors proves him wrong. In the Old Testament, Yahweh is Lord of Nature. 'Nothing happens in Nature, great or small, except by His will, and that will follow the definite laws of Yahweh's own self-consistent being.'[5] 'The God of Christianity is not the God of eighteenth-century deism, that is, a God who, having created the world, turned it loose and pays no further attention to it. On the contrary, He is the abiding Ground of all being, the continuing Source of all finite existence, the Sustainer of the world as well as its original Creator.'[6] Such a Creator must reveal Himself in His creation, as Ps 19 and Ro 1^{20}, the most explicit of many passages, point out.[7] Nature displays majesty and power, unity and order, regularity and permanence, and all these testify to the wisdom, the glory, the everlasting divinity of the Creator.

2. *Nature does not reveal God always and everywhere.* 'There is in the world of Nature an abundance of phenomena which impress upon us the meaninglessness and the cold insensitivity of existence. These imply a testing rather than a support of faith.'[8] Bishop Aulén goes on to speak of the Lisbon earthquake of 1755 with its disastrous consequences for 'the naïve and optimistic faith that the whole universe was governed in all its details by a consistent and benevolent purpose.' The earthquake is but one example of the bewildering perversity of Nature. Other examples are so many that particular explanations fail to satisfy and we look for some more fundamental reason why at times Nature denies, or appears to deny, the care, the concern, the faithfulness of God as He is known in Christ.

3. *Much of what the Christian faith asserts about God cannot be revealed in Nature.* The God of the harvest may be one with the God of faith, but 'God of the harvest' is an inadequate definition. For the Christian, the decisive revelation of God is in Christ. 'In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.' If we compare the revelation in Nature with the revelation in Christ, the conclusion can only be that in Nature much Divine truth is hidden.[9] The holiness of God, His

[1] 'Here, as everywhere, the Unfulfilled Intention, which makes life what it is, was as obvious as it could be among the depraved crowds of a city slum. The leaf was deformed, the curve was crippled, the taper was interrupted; the lichen ate the vigour of the stalk, and the ivy slowly strangled to death the promising sapling' (*The Woodlanders*, 62).

[2] *Lines composed a few miles above Tintern Abbey.*

[3] H. W. Robinson, *Suffering, Human and Divine*, 120.

[4] Karl Barth, *Romans*, Eng. tr., 307.

[5] Oesterley and Robinson, *Hebrew Religion*, 226.

[6] Theodore M. Greene, in *The Christian Answer*, ed. Henry P. Van Dusen, 101.

[7] Also Gn 1–2, Dt 11^{10-12}, Job 5^{8-10} 28^{23-28} 38–41, Ps 104, Pr 8^{22-31}, Is 40^{28} 44^{24}, Jer 14^{22}, Mt $5^{34f.45}$ 6^{26-30}, etc.

[8] Gustaf Aulén, *The Faith of the Christian Church*, 32.

[9] Aulén, *op. cit.*, 177.

abhorrence of sin, His redeeming love, all are absent, and it is difficult to speak of a knowledge of God that excludes them. If Christian faith cannot trace in Nature a revelation of God that is more than fragmentary, the uncommitted observer may expect to find still less—a fact that reveals how limited some of the traditional arguments for belief in God were.[1]

We are left in confusion. The revelation in Nature is veiled and incomplete. We cannot proceed simply and logically from Nature to God, and yet Nature is there, in all its grandeur, witnessing to something, and requiring our consideration. In this dilemma we may well begin by examining the Bible more closely.

The Creation stories make it clear that the Old Testament writers came to consider Yahweh as entirely responsible for the Creation, and His work to be flawless. It is significant that the Creation myth of the people that tilled the rough slopes of Palestine should recount that the Lord God planted a garden. The refrain, 'And God saw that it was good,' is repeated seven times in Gn 1. This not only meant that the natural order fulfilled the designs of its Creator, but that its beneficence was evident. There was no cause for confusion. The ground brought forth plentifully. The heavens were His handiwork and He reigned in majesty over sky and sea, cloud and wind, rock and mountain. 'O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all.'

The noxious element in Nature does not appear in Gn 1. When it does appear, it is not as a phase of the original creation, but as the Divine response to man's first rebellion (Gn 3^{17-19}). The blighting of the ground and the perversion of Nature have, in the myth, a historical occasion and a historical cause. There is little comment on this narrative in the rest of the Bible, though the underlying assumption, that the earth is no longer as God created it, is unmistakable. An echo can be heard in The Book of Jubilees, 'And all flesh corrupted its way, alike men and cattle and beasts and birds and everything that walks on the earth—all of them corrupted their ways and their orders, and they began to devour each other. . . . And God looked upon the earth, and behold it was corrupt.'[2] In the Gospels, one or two cryptic remarks refer to a Satanic invasion of the natural order. Illness was often described as the work of Satan (Mt 9^{32}, Lk 11^{14-20} 13^{16}), and the fact that our Lord healed at all suggests that He saw in some diseases a derangement of the Divine order that His Kingdom must restore. In Lk 10^{19} the venom of serpent and scorpion is regarded as part of 'the power of the enemy,' and despite the exaggerated variant in Mk 16^{18}, this can hardly be dismissed as mere superstition. The most noteworthy reference in the New Testament is Ro 8^{20}, 'the creation was subjected to vanity.' This simple sentence with its immense implications fits naturally into the general pattern of Pauline thought. Paul counted the present æon as evil (Gal 1^{4}), and the evil was not limited to the human race. The 'rulers of this world' shared it (1 Co 2^{8}), and 'the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places' (Eph 6^{12}; cf. 2^{2}). Strife and decay proclaimed that something was amiss with Nature too, for Nature was included in the present evil age. The natural explanation for Paul was that 'all created things are suffering from an imperfection which has been brought on them by the sin of man.'[3]

In the present age, the fallen creation groans and travails in waiting for its redemption. Can such a redemption be? The Bible asserts that it can. Several passages in the Old Testament suggest that there is a Divine plan to regenerate Nature that only waits for certain factors to be fulfilled. Reliable harvests and safety from wild beasts will accompany obedience (Lv 26^{3-6}), and the end of the time of chastening (Am 9^{13}). Isaiah 11 links the renewal of Nature with the Messianic Kingdom. One of the signs of this Kingdom will be the pacification of the beast of prey with, consequently, a new security for his victim. 'The regeneration of human society is to be accompanied by a restoration of the harmony of creation.'[4] After the captivity, the current expectation was that God would renew His creation, that is to say, replace the corruptible and tragic world with a redeemed and incorruptible one.[5] The details are difficult to trace and they would be unimportant, but it is certain that intertestamental writers expected that there would be a renovation of the natural order at the final judgment (IV Ezra 7^{75} 11^{46} 13^{26}). Book III of the Sibylline Oracles reproduces the picture of Is 11 almost verbatim (lines 788–795). Matthew 19^{28} speaks of the *παλιγγενεσία*, a term which implies the renovation of creation as well as the human race. The key passage is again Ro 8. On *v.* 21 C. H. Dodd writes, Paul 'shared with many of his contemporaries the belief that, in the Good Time Coming, the material universe would be transfigured into a substance

[1] John Baillie, *Our Knowledge of God*, 129; A. E. Taylor, *Does God Exist?* 77 ff.

[2] 5^{2f}. This passage is linked with the irregular intercourse described in Gn 6, but in 3^{28}, Jubilees recounts that beasts were deprived of speech following the sin of Gn 3.

[3] E. F. Scott, *Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, 51.

[4] J. Skinner, *Isaiah*, chs. i.–xxxix. (Cambridge Bible for Schools), 106. See also Hos 2^{18}, Ezk $34^{25.28}$, Is 65^{25}.

[5] See R. H. Charles on 2 Baruch 32^{6} and 57^{2} in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, ii. 499, 513.

consisting of pure light and glory, thus returning to its original perfection as created by God.' [1] Nature, then, is waiting for deliverance from the bondage of corruption, for the consummation that will restore to the whole creation its original purpose.

So much for the Biblical view. It remains to see how we might profit by it. There can be little disagreement about the Bible's stress on Yahweh as Lord of Creation. God is, almost by definition, Creator, separate from and above His work, and not imprisoned in it. Genesis 1 asserts the dependence of the visible cosmos upon the creative will of God, and we readily accept the assertion.

The second assertion of Genesis, that man sinned and the corruption of Nature was the result of his sin, is not so easy. The implication of Gn 3, that the Fall was extended from man to Nature, cannot be accepted, if for no other reason than that Nature, in its contradictory state, existed before man. But we need not, therefore, assume that there is no link between the shortcomings and tragedies of man and the 'sense of something wanting' in Nature.[2] It is idle to deny that Nature has, as Paul asserted, in some unrecorded way, been 'subjected to vanity,' 'rendered futile,' brought under 'the tyranny of change and decay,' in the same way as man has been. 'It was not man alone, but the world in which he lives, that was subjected to death. The ground is cursed because of him. The whole existence in which we are involved stands in bondage to corruption.' [3] 'This is, no doubt, a pessimistic mood, but, if it is one-sided, it rests on insight into the facts.' [4] If the explanation is not that the Fall of man infected Nature, can it not be that some greater, premundane Fall infected both? What is the meaning of those strange Pauline phrases, 'the rulers of this world,' and 'the spiritual hosts of wickedness'? The allusion is surely to the widely held belief that strife began in heaven before Creation, resulting in a Kingdom of Darkness as well as a Kingdom of Light. Creation and man, as they appeared, became new battlegrounds in this rebellion, as the hosts of wickedness tried vainly but tragically to assert their power. So Nature and man were dragged down to corruption and futility.

The solution, as we are coming more and more to recognize in every branch of theology, does not lie in this present age. The process of redemption, this 'cosmic drama,' in Bultmann's phrase,[5] though begun, is not yet consummated. The realm of redemption, at present limited to the company of believers, must be extended till God's eternal plan is fulfilled with not only the restoration of man, but the liberation of Nature, and even the release of the spiritual beings.[6] This is the cosmic redemption that Paul is groping for in Eph 1[10]. Christ is to be its centre and its cause. The Incarnation and the Cross were the decisive engagement, and the victory, first proclaimed in the Resurrection of Christ from the dead, will be broadened and extended until man and Nature and the most mysterious and indefinable of created things, the spiritual beings, will be restored.[7] 'It will concern not only individuals, but it will have cosmic meaning and cosmic dimensions. Only then, in union with this total fulfilment, will "the revealing of the sons of God" take place.' [8]

This brings us to the last point in the enquiry. Because the creation waits for 'the revealing of the sons of God,' the redemption of man will be the *means* of the redemption of Nature. 'In some way we cannot dream of the salvation of men will bring about the perfecting of the whole world.' [9] Professor C. S. Lewis makes some interesting remarks on this subject in his *The Problem of Pain*,[10] but most commentators are not prepared to speculate. The Bible provides no further enlightenment on this point. The redemption of man is the signal for the great transformation. Whether there is any further, causal connexion, we may not know.

If this statement is accepted, it is remarkable how many of the difficulties and how much of the confusion disappears.

1. The facts of experience with which we began are explained, and it is a real resolution, no mere escape or denial of inescapable factors. God is known in Nature because the grandeur, the scope, the design, are His. The corruption of Nature by evil has detracted from this plan and produced the rapacity and cruelty that shocks and worries everyone who cares to think about them. The healing of diseases is thus an inevitable expression of the Kingdom of Righteousness our Lord came to proclaim.

2. The uniqueness of Christ is emphasized. Pantheism is for ever impossible. The perfect revelation of God is shown to men alone in Christ, for Christ alone in the material universe has defied infection. In Nature and man, God's handiwork is marred. In Christ, the truth is uncompromised, the revelation complete. The way from sin to God is not through Nature but through Christ. But once this way is known, once God is known

[1] *Romans* (M.N.T.C.), 134.
[2] Sanday and Headlam, *Romans* (*I.C.C.*), 207.
[3] Anders Nygren, *Romans*, Eng. tr., 331.
[4] Dodd, *op. cit.*, 133.
[5] *Theology of the New Testament*, Eng. tr., i. 347.
[6] G. B. Stevens, *The Theology of the New Testament*, 378 f.
[7] E. F. Scott, *Ephesians* (*M.N.T.C.*), 125, 132 ff.
[8] Nygren, *op. cit.*, 332.
[9] E. F. Scott, *Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, 52.
[10] Pp. 126–31. Similarly, George Adam Smith, *The Book of Isaiah*, I–XXXIX, 188–194.

in Christ, Nature can be understood. The believer can feast his soul upon the majesty of the natural world because his fellowship with the God who shaped it is already established.

> Heaven above is softer blue,
> Earth around is sweeter green;
> Something lives in every hue,
> Christless eyes have never seen.[1]

3. The meaning of the Fall and the scope of our Redemption assume new and proper proportions. No account of evil is satisfactory if it limits it to human volition. The sin of man is part of a larger sin, as both theologian and saint will agree. Evil has a cosmic and spiritual significance that goes outside of our ken, and the significance of the plan of Redemption is likewise beyond us. We must grasp the magnitude of the struggle. The work of Christ does more than treat the ills of the human race. It overcomes evil 'in the heavenly places' and opens the way for the restoration of the whole divided creation. There is, therefore, not merely an analogy between the way of Nature and the way of man, but both share a place in the same redemptive plan.

There will be objections. It will be said that, if animals were not carnivorous, they would multiply so quickly that there would be neither room nor food for them. To this, Professor C. S. Lewis seems to have the complete reply when he says that the immense birth rate among animals is a corrective phenomenon.[2] The large death rate has produced a large birth rate. Secondly, there are those who would argue that there is no problem because what appears to us as travail in Nature is all within the hidden will of God. But there is a problem. We feel, and it is not mere faithlessness, that Nature is at times revolting and cruel. That widespread revulsion would itself be a problem even if we could persuade ourselves that the cause of it was not. Thirdly, it may be said that illness is used by God to nurture faith. This is true, but God bends every circumstance, even sin, to His purpose. 'God can indeed turn evil into good and "compel even injury to profit us," but the conclusion must not therefore be drawn that evil is sent by God and is an expression of His will.'[3] Finally, it may be said that this picture denies God's lordship over creation. It means that Nature has got out of His control, and that is surely a mis-statement for the Christian. The conception of a fallen Nature, however, denies God's lordship no more than the conception of a fallen race. The existence of the one, 'original' sin, whatever that may be, is the greatest affront to God's holiness, but the notion we have argued here does not add to it, but merely follows out its implications.

No one will deny the need for further thought on this subject. It is as important in everyday experience as in theological discussion. In our search for clarity we must recognize that we may not know the whole. We cannot avoid mystery, but it may help if we can dispense with confusion.

[1] G. W. Robinson.
[2] *Op. cit.*, 123.
[3] Aulén, *op. cit.*, 196.

A Doxology not to God but Christ

By the Reverend C. Clare Oke, M.A., Th.D., Dover Centre, Ontario, Canada

'Now to the King of the ages, immortal, invisible, alone divine, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.'—1 Ti 1[17].

This noble doxology is invariably conceived as having God the Father in mind (so White, Lowstuter, Falconer, E. F. Scott, Easton). The last two commentators are particularly settled in judgment about that. 'As he thinks of the eternal life which is given through Christ,' says Scott, 'the writer praises God who reigns eternally.' 'Although Christ alone is mentioned in *vv.* 12–16,' writes Easton, and the seeing of that should have made him more cautious, 'the doxology is, of course, addressed to God, in thanksgiving for the redemption in Christ.'

It apparently has not been noticed that *θεῷ* without the article is capable of being translated otherwise than simply as 'God' and of referring to Christ.

As Moulton points out and illustrates in his *Prolegomena*, 82f., there is a qualitative force in anarthrous nouns. 'The lists of words which specially affect the dropped article will, of course, need careful examination for the individual cases. Thus, when Winer includes *πατήρ* in his list, and quotes Jn 1[14] and He 12[7], we must feel that in both passages the qualitative force is very apparent—"what son is there whom his father, *as a father*, does not chasten?" (On the former passage see R.V. margin, and the note in WM, 151.) For exegesis, there are few of the finer points of Greek which need more constant

attention than this omission of the article when the writer would lay stress on the quality or character of the object. Even the R.V. misses this badly sometimes, as in Jn 6[68] ['Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life'].' To the last reference Moulton adds a footnote, 'The marginal reading stood in the text in the First Revision. It is one among very many places where a conservative minority damaged the work by the operation of the two-thirds rule.' In Jn 1[14] it is not only *πατρός* that is anarthrous but also *μονογενοῦς*, and that indicates, as Dods asserts, that the phrase is not dogmatic or theological but illustrative—'glory such as an only son enjoys from his father' (so Moffatt excellently). A note in Abbott-Smith's *Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament* should also be quoted. He says that *θεός* is anarthrous 'when the nature and character rather than the person of God is meant,' and he refers to Milligan's *Thessalonians*, 14.

In considering our present passage we cannot but think also of Jn 1[1]. The Evangelist is not making a deliberate identification of the Logos or of Christ with God but is describing the character of the former. In his thesis on *The Logos Doctrine of Philo Judaeus*, L. O. Bristol states that the Logos is called God by Philo, 'with a careful distinction being made between *θεός* and *ὁ θεός* (*De Fuga et Inventione*, xvii. 97). Philo says that God sent the Logos to the earthly sphere and appointed it as *θεός* with power over the mind and body (*De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, iii. 9).' Whether John was affected here by Philo or not, it is quite certain that *θεός* should be rendered 'of the nature of God' (Gardner) or 'divine' (Moffatt, Goodspeed). Robinson remarks correctly that *θεός* is practically an adjective.

We cannot but think as well of Jn 1[18] where *θεός* instead of *υἱός* is read by ℵ B.C. * L and where, with instances of the use of *μονογενής* in the LXX and with the Gospels in mind and especially Jn 1[1] and 1[14], we may translate, 'the only-begotten (and so highly prized) divine One.' C. H. Dodd claims that *μονογενής* means 'alone of his kind, unique.'

Now with this information and these passages before us let us return to our passage in 1 Timothy. Is it now obvious, as Easton supposes, that the allusion is to God? Is it not rather probable, linguistically alone, that the reference is to Christ? The passage can and, I think, should be translated, 'Now to the King of the ages, immortal, invisible, alone divine, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.' With Christ who is the theme of the whole paragraph (12ff.) still in mind the Pastor is rendering Him an apostrophe of praise, not of course meaning by *μόνῳ θεῷ* that Christ is alone divine rather than God but that in comparison with all other beings human or angelic He is solely divine, of the very same nature or character as God Himself. *θεῷ* should be regarded as virtually an adjective parallel to but climaxing *ἀφθάρτῳ* and *ἀοράτῳ*.

It is true that 'King of the ages' מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם occurs very frequently in Hebrew prayers of thanksgiving in relation to God. But it is also true that the phrase be naturally applied to Christ. Christ in His present existence and functioning was thought of in Paul's theology as guiding and enabling (Ga 5[16. 25], 2 Co 3[6], Ro 7[6]) in the partial, anticipatory form of the Spirit (an earnest or pledge, 2 Co 1[22] 5[5], Eph 1[14]; for the identification, cf. Ro 8[9-10]), and as interceding for us in that same form (Ro 8[26] parallel to 8[34]), but also as exercising governance and rule. 'All will be made to live,' writes Paul (1 Co 15[22ff.]), 'but each in his proper rank: Christ as the first sheaf to be reaped; after that the people of Christ at His Parousia. Then comes the end, when He hands over the royal power to Him who is God and Father when He has liquidated[1] every demonic rule and every superhuman authority and power. For He must reign until He has put all these enemies under His feet. It is as last enemy that Death is to be liquidated. For "(God) subjected all things under His feet".' Was it not natural and inevitable that the One pictured as waging successful war against the powers of evil and reigning until He had put all enemies under His feet should be described as King of the world or the ages?

It is true that the phraseology that follows the mention of Kingship is extremely similar to that used of God in the magnificent doxology in 1 Ti 6[15f.]. The appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ will be effected in His own seasons by God 'who is the blessed and only Sovereign, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who alone enjoys immortality, who inhabits unapproachable light, whom none of the race of men has seen or can see. To Him be honour and eternal power. Amen.' But it is also true again that Christ is specially connected with immortality or, more precisely, incorruption, in 2 Ti 1[10] where He is described as One 'who has emasculated the (supreme enemy) Death and disclosed life and immortality through the gospel.'

[1] 'The basic meaning of *καταργέω* is "to render ineffective," to "demonetise"; and its secondary meaning is "to crush" or "to annihilate"' (W. A. Visser 'T Hooft, *The Kingship of Christ*, 55). Our modern totalitarian word 'liquidate' is an exact equivalent.

Expository Problems

The Nature Miracles

By the Reverend William Neil, B.D., Ph.D., The University of Nottingham

C. S. Lewis has said that 'every particular Christian miracle manifests at a particular place and moment the character and significance of the Incarnation' (*The Miracles*, 131). This is the Grand Miracle beside which such questions as how it was possible for Jesus to feed five thousand people with five loaves and two fish (Mk 6^{38}) or to wither a fig tree with a curse (Mk $11^{13-14.\ 20-21}$) must be regarded as trifling and cavilling.

St. Paul established this line of argument when he said 'if Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain' (1 Co 15^{14}). The supreme wonder of the resurrection of Jesus was for St. Paul the foundation of belief and to those who built their faith upon One who rose from the dead it presented no problem to be told that He also walked on the water (Mk 6^{48}) and stilled a storm (Mk 4^{39}).

It is fully in keeping with this order of priorities to say, therefore, with Hoskyns and Davey: 'The physical miracles are external signs of the supreme Messianic Miracle, the rescue of men from the grip of the powers of evil—from sin. The supreme Messianic Miracle to which the miracles point is the salvation of men by the power of the Living God exercised through the agency of the Messiah' (*The Riddle of the New Testament*, 120).

If we are to use the word 'miracle' properly it ought to be reserved for the fundamental assertion of Christian theology that God was in Christ—in His Incarnation, Death, Resurrection, and Exaltation: that the Carpenter of Nazareth is the Saviour of the World: that Jesus is Lord and God. For the essential meaning of a miracle in the Biblical sense is surely that it is an event that shows unmistakable evidence of the hand of God in human affairs. If the whole normal process of daily experience, not only in the natural order of the changing seasons and the beauty and rhythm of Nature, but in the ups and downs of personal life and the movement of history bespeaks the ceaseless intervention of God and His constant conversation with man, He is undoubtedly most clearly evident through His Word made flesh, now risen and glorified.

To approach the question of Biblical miracles, therefore, from the nineteenth century viewpoint of a fixed and unalterable order of Nature, with laws which may or may not have been imposed by a remote Divine Providence but which are at all events so rigid that any alleged interruption or violation of them must be regarded with extreme suspicion, is a procedure quite foreign to Biblical ways of thought. Both in the recording of individual miracles and in their use for missionary and instructional purposes the Early Church thought of them not as violations of the natural order but as signs of the power and presence of God in their midst.

This was surely the sense in which Jesus regarded His acts of healing, whether of mind or of body, and there is no indication that what we call the 'Nature Miracles' were thought of in any different way. They were all evidence of a new order in which the power of God was at work through His Messiah in hitherto unknown ways. Evil was being encountered and defeated—whether it was the demonic distortion of man's sanity, the assault upon his natural vigour and vitality by disease, the foretaste of death, or the insensate fury of a storm at sea. If the Lord sent bread from heaven to feed His hungry children in the wilderness (Ex 16) should His anointed Messiah not likewise feed His people in their need? (Mk 6^{30}).

This Biblical God-centred all-embracing view of life is one which the modern mind does not find all too easy to share. The idea of a cast-iron code of natural laws, even if we are prepared to admit that God Himself imposed them on the universe, was for a time so strongly advanced, and that within living memory, that many of us are reluctant to recognize how radically science itself has departed from it. The spiritualization of science, if we may call it so, is none the less a factor which enables us to enter more fully into the point of view of the Biblical writers and the early Christians than would have been thought possible eighty years ago.

Matter as a 'hard fact' has been replaced by entities so intangible that it no longer appears outrageous for a scientist to speak of the universe as the thought of a Master Mind. Psychology and medicine alike would agree that the dichotomy

between body and mind is a false one. Responsible physicists would be the first to agree that the natural laws which appeared so rigid to our grandfathers are simply the hitherto observable ways in which Nature seems to work. They would neither suggest that it is impossible for these 'laws' to be broken, nor would they claim that we have done anything more than touch the fringe of the ultimate mystery that encompasses our being and the world we live in.

This humility is not shared by some of the more aggressive of the lesser fry among the scientists, still less by the cocksure devotees of the potted science of part of the popular press which still regards science as having delivered the death blow to creeds and Bible alike. Unfortunately it is mainly with this type that we have to contend in parish missions and in any public apologetic for a Biblical interpretation of the universe.

It should be noted, however, as an interesting reflection of the changing attitude of the more intelligent section of the community that in student circles the 'miraculous' in the old sense does not appear to present the problem which it did twenty to thirty years ago. Then it might well be said that the difficulty of presenting religion to the student mind was one of giving a satisfactory explanation of such apparently irrational features of Christianity as the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, and the Nature Miracles. To-day their question is the much more fundamental one as to whether there is any purpose or meaning in life at all. If they are prepared to accept a theistic view of the universe the problem of the miraculous does not appear to worry them unduly. They would share St. Paul's view that, having accepted the supreme miracle, the others present little difficulty.

The change in the climate of New Testament criticism over the past twenty odd years has not been without effect on our approach to the question of the Nature Miracles as a whole. The Form-critics with their rule of thumb method of dividing the Gospel material into categories of reliability tended to relegate the Nature Miracles to the bottom of the list and dub them 'wonder stories.' They were supposed to find their closest analogy in the pagan tales of gods and heroes. Few scholars in this country would accept that verdict now. They would, however, be much more ready to admit the Form-critics' contention that whatever the historical basis of the incident may originally have been, its appearance in the Gospels does not rest primarily on a desire to record a matter of 'fact' but to illustrate the power of God. Interpretation of the event bulks larger than the event itself. Nor can we hope to disentangle the one from the other. We cannot go behind the form in which the story is recorded and find the actual 'event,' because what 'happened' was not only the thing itself but the effect on the witnesses, and the purpose in telling the story at all includes a variety of theological and didactic motives which are inseparable from the incident that lies at the back of them.

Thus it is beside the mark to inquire whether on the particular occasion as recorded in the Gospel story Jesus did 'in fact' walk on the surface of the water of the Lake of Galilee without sinking, or did 'in fact' appease the physical hunger of a horde of people on a handful of loaves and fish. If literal Western minds put such questions, which are foreign to the Biblical way of thinking, the answer we must bluntly give is that if Christ is what the Church claims Him to be we dare not say that anything was impossible for Him. Is it any more incredible that He should have 'violated' the 'Laws of Nature' in this way than that He 'violated' them in healing with a touch or with a word or raising from the dead?

But the question is ill-put and does not take us very far towards an understanding of the real significance of these Nature Miracles. Each one stands by itself and must be looked at individually to see what it is trying to teach us. We must ask of each one of them why it is placed in exactly the position in the Gospel record that it occupies, what relation it bears to Old Testament prophecy and to the Messianic Kingdom. We must try to see what message it would have for the readers of the Gospel in their particular situation in the first century Church and, finally, from all of this, what message it has for us to-day.

We shall certainly have done little more than scratch the surface, if all that emerges is a picture of a wonder working Christ who on certain dramatic occasions did things that ordinary men could not do. The narrative of the Temptation in the Wilderness gives us the clue to Jesus' own mind on the matter. God's Messiah would not indulge in stunts to win a following (Mt 4^{5-7}). His constantly reiterated warning against the wrong kind of publicity is consistent with His refusal to give the Pharisees some spectacular proof of His Messiahship (Mk 8^{11}), a demand which was made in vain right up to the Crucifixion (Mt 27^{42}). Christ's miracles were 'signs' of the power and love of God which flowed from the Son's perfect union with the Father. For us as for the first Christians the most significant of the Nature Miracles are those which appear to shed most light on the nature and purpose of God, which are, in fact, most in keeping with the ministry of compassion, the victory over sin and the defeat of evil which the miracles in general illustrate.

Some of the Nature Miracles would, in this sense, hardly come into the category of 'signs' at

all. The story of the Coin in the Fish's Mouth (Mt 17^{24-27}) not only does not tell us that the coin was found, but, even if it did, the form of the story marks it out as one of a small number of passages in Matthew which serve to enhance the prestige of Peter in the Church. The tailpiece (*v.* 27) which contains the 'miraculous' element falls into the category of Haggada, of the type which the rabbis wove round Old Testament stories.

A similar motif seems to be behind the story of the Draught of Fish which is recorded by both Luke ($5^{1ff.}$) and John ($21^{6ff.}$). In itself there is nothing 'miraculous' in the sudden appearance of a shoal of fish. In the Lucan version the size of the catch is emphasized, and in both cases Jesus is responsible for detecting it. But in neither case is the emphasis upon the fish as such, but upon the part played by Peter as the chief apostle. He is presented quite clearly as the great fisher of men (*v.* 9), the man under whose leadership the Church will draw into its net a countless host of converts. The Galilean setting of what must have been a not infrequent experience for fishermen is used to foreshadow the experience of the mission: toiling often without success, but, faithful to the command of Jesus, continuing with its task and reaping in the end a rich harvest. This aspect of the story is of course its main value for us to-day. In the Johannine version (21^{13}) there is also a Eucharistic reference.

Two of the miracles which present peculiar difficulties may likewise fairly be removed from this category and placed in that of prophetic symbols or acted parables, namely, the Cursing of the Barren Fig Tree (Mk $11^{12-14.\ 20-25}$), and the Changing of Water into Wine (Jn 2^{1-11}). Neither of them, however, is entitled to be transferred from one category to the other simply because it stretches our credulity. The disturbing feature about both of them is that they do not appear to record actions of Jesus which are consonant with the picture we get of Him in the Gospels as a whole.

In the case of the Cursing of the Barren Fig Tree Jesus is presented in a petulant mood which is quite uncharacteristic. He is hungry, and because a fig tree on the roadside does not provide the means of satisfying His hunger, even although as we are told it could not be expected to do so at that time of the year (*v.* 13), He pronounces a curse upon it which results in its total destruction. It is difficult to believe that Mark intended the story to be taken literally.

Isaiah's Parable of the Vineyard (5^{1-7}) and Luke's Parable of the Fig Tree (13^{6-9}) provide parallels too close to be disregarded. The vineyard in Isaiah was, as the prophet indicated (*v.* 7), the symbol for Israel, on which God had lavished all His loving care only to find that it produced sour grapes. Judgment was therefore inevitable. In the Lucan parable the analogy is plain. The fig tree in the vineyard which should have produced fruit is still Israel. The people of God, both priests and laity, Sadducees and Pharisees, who ought to have been custodians of the truth of God, bearing fruit by their example and their winning of the world for God, had become dead wood, destined, in default of reformation, for ultimate destruction.

This is surely the clue to the Marcan story. It is an acted parable. Its setting in Passion Week, after the Triumphal Entry and before the Cleansing of the Temple, points to its character as a piece of symbolism enacted by the Messiah. As the prophet had foretold the judgment of God on a fruitless people, so His Messiah denounces the empty religiosity of Pharisee and Sadducee—an impressive show of foliage but without nourishment for people hungering for the truth. Here for us, too, is criticism and condemnation of much of the ecclesiasticism and empty formalism of our Christian witness to the world.

It is not only the advocates of total abstinence who find difficulty in preaching on the Changing of the Water into Wine (Jn 2^{1-11}). Even those who would stress the social value of alcohol in moderation and relate this story to other Gospel references to Jesus' participation in good fellowship must recognize that at a gathering where men have 'drunk freely' (*v.* 10) the gratuitous provision of an additional hundred to a hundred and fifty gallons of wine is not an act of human wisdom far less of Divine compassion. Once again, however, we notice the position of this story as a prelude to the Cleansing of the Temple ($2^{13\ ff.}$) and indeed to the whole public ministry of Jesus.

This ought to suggest to us that we are not being asked to believe that our Lord was guilty of an act of dubious wisdom, to say nothing of black magic, but that we are being given the theme of the gospel: the supersession of the insipid water of Jewish ceremonialism by the invigorating rich new wine of Christian truth. Christian missionaries, the 'servants' of the story who knew Christ as the Source of the new life, knew also that the best had been kept to the end not only at the wedding but in God's plan of salvation. For us the message of the story is the same as that of Nicodemus in the following chapter, that we must be born again, transformed by the power of Christ, and as this parable teaches us, witness to Him not in a spirit of gloomy religiosity but in the rich context of human fellowship.

Turning to the miracles of the Stilling of the Storm (Mk 4^{35-41}), and Christ Walking on the Water (Mk 6^{45-52}), we shall do well to avoid any attempts at rationalization, such as that storms

arise and subside with startling suddenness on the Lake of Galilee, or that Jesus was not walking *on* the lake but *beside* the lake or on a shelf or rock which projected into the lake under the surface. In both cases the event described is quite clearly regarded as a quite extraordinary happening for which Jesus was responsible. But equally clearly in neither case is the emphasis upon the miracle as an arbitrary disruption of the normal processes of Nature but as a sign of Jesus' Messiahship.

The Jews were no sailors. They were not at home on the sea. It represented for them storms and perils, and the demonic forces that lay behind all evil. Jesus' Stilling of the Storm was therefore part of His battle against Satan and his myrmidons. It was by the power of God, according to the Psalmist (Ps 107^{27-32}) that storms were calmed. By showing Himself to be Lord of the sea Jesus showed Himself to be God's Messiah. By subduing the demon of the storm He proved His power over evil as clearly as by mastering the demon that possessed the madman in the synagogue (1^{21} ff.). The same expression is used in both cases: 'Be muzzled' (1^{25} and 4^{39}). For Mark the main point of the story is the question at the end: 'Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?' The Stilling of the Storm was part of the self-revelation of the Messiah and the gradual opening of the disciples' eyes to the real identity of Jesus which culminated at Cæsarea Philippi (8^{29}).

Moreover, the Old Testament had made use of the sea as a symbol of the storms and troubles of life (*e.g.*, Is 57^{20}). In both stories, clearly the lesson is being taught that Christ never fails His people on the storm-tossed sea of life. Even when He appears not to see their plight (4^{38} 6^{48}), in their darkest hour He comes to them. No doubt Mark had the persecution in Rome in mind, but the message is timeless. It is possible that the Walking on the Water had its historical basis in a post-Resurrection appearance. Matthew inserts into the Marcan story an additional element which forms part of the Petrine supplement (14^{28-31}) emphasizing the primacy of Peter in the Church. He is shown in the symbolism of this narrative as the Rock-man whose courage failed him at the critical moment until by Christ's help he was enabled to fulfil the rôle appointed for him.

Of all the miracles none is less susceptible of rationalization than that of the Loaves and Fishes. It makes nonsense of it to suggest that all that happened was that Jesus and the disciples set an example of sharing, which induced the crowd to produce their own private lunch-packets. The fact that all the Gospels record this incident and that Mark not only has two versions of it but makes various further allusions to it should suggest to us also that this is not merely an occurrence concerned with the satisfaction of the physical hunger of a Palestinian crowd. If this were all that was involved the disciples must have been more than ordinarily obtuse, when after two such miracles they were still concerned about a shortage of bread (Mk 8^{16}). Jesus' reply makes it obvious that this is no mere matter of satisfying the needs of the body.

It is indeed the most theological of the miracles: replete with allusions backwards to the Old Testament and forward to the eschatological Messianic Kingdom. It points from the Bread from Heaven and the Water from the Rock with which Moses fed the People of God on the First Exodus, coupled with Elisha's Feeding of the Multitude (2 K 4^{42-44}), to One who supersedes Moses and Elijah (or Elisha, his shadow), as at the Transfiguration, by providing Himself as the Bread of Life. Not only is it a 'sign' whereby the Messiah makes His identity plain by 'fulfilling' the Old Testament, although the crowd including the disciples do not see this significance, but it is also a foreshadowing of the Messianic Banquet, a declaration in acted parable of the all-embracing mercy of God. In the first Marcan Feeding (6^{30-44}) the symbolism of the Jewish numbers five and twelve—Pentateuch and Tribes—is matched in the Second Feeding (8^{1-9}) by the symbolism of the Gentile number seven—seventy nations, Septuagint, seven deacons. The Kingdom is thrown open to Jews and Gentiles alike, and in the symbolism of the Breaking of the Bread the Messiah enacts prophetically the Last Supper, the Great Banquet of the Kingdom of God and the Eucharistic celebration by which the Church connects them.

Our Lord Himself shows us the real significance of this miracle and its abiding message: 'I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst' (Jn 6^{35}). We cannot go far wrong if we take this type of interpretation as the key to the problem of the Nature Miracles as a whole.

Recent Foreign Theology

The Theology of Hellenistic Judaism. It is well established that at the beginning of the Christian era the Jews of the Diaspora had made many converts to Judaism, though somewhat contradictory views on the wisdom of this are attributed in tradition to the Palestinian rabbis. P. Dalbert has now published a careful study of Hellenistic-Jewish literature, with the exception of Philo and Josephus, with reference to this question.[1] Philo and Josephus are omitted because many studies have been devoted to them. Some other works, such as the Books of Maccabees, are felt to lie outside the range of the present work and are therefore also omitted. The authors studied are Demetrius, Philo the Elder, Eupolemus, Artapanus, Ezekiel the Tragedian, Pseudo-Hecataeus, Aristeas, Aristobulus, and the authors of Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Sibylline Oracles. Many of the works of these authors are extant only incompletely, sometimes in citations. Nevertheless it is valuable to have them carefully studied and their teaching clearly examined. The study is introduced by an account of the Diaspora and its relations with its environment, and after the separate examination of the various authors, their teaching is gathered together under the headings of monotheism, revelation, and the election of Israel. As might be expected, a broad liberalism characterizes the Judaism of some of these works, where there is more emphasis on the faith of Judaism than on its forms.

Dutch Bible Dictionary. In 1941 a Dutch one-volume Bible Dictionary of about eight hundred pages, prepared by a team of Dutch and Belgian Catholic scholars, was published. A complete revision or rewriting of this work has now been undertaken, and the first part, carrying the Dictionary down to the beginning of the article on Egypt, has appeared.[2] The list of scholars whose names appear on the title-page includes some of the names which stood there in the first edition, but there are some new additions, including J. Coppens, J. van der Ploeg, and J. de Fraine. Altogether more than thirty scholars have contributed articles to the work. The changes introduced into this edition are considerable, and it is appreciably longer than its predecessor. There are some new articles, and bibliographies have been brought up-to-date. Throughout the world there is considerable activity in Biblical study amongst Roman Catholics, and this revised work will enable readers to keep in touch with that activity.

Dutch One Volume Commentary. Two further parts of the one volume commentary being issued by a team of Dutch Protestant scholars have appeared.[3] The earlier parts[4] had covered the Old Testament and some of the general articles on the New Testament. The present parts complete these general articles (' Textual Criticism,' by W. C. van Unnik, and ' Canon,' by J. de Zwaan), and contain the commentary on Matthew, Mark, and Luke 1–13 (all by W. S. van Leeuwen). The Biblical text is not given, but the commentary is reasonably full and is of the verse by verse type. There is a short Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels, which contents itself with analysing these Gospels into Mark, Q, M, and L, but which takes little account of recent developments of Synoptic Criticism. The work of Vaganay[5] is doubtless too recent to be mentioned, but some modifications of the simple four source view might have been mentioned.

Verbum Salutis. In the excellent little series of French Catholic commentaries on the New Testament, published under the title *Verbum Salutis*, two volumes have been reissued in revised form. One is the commentary on the Johannine Epistles by J. Bonsirven.[6] Most of the volume is naturally taken up with the first of these Epistles. There is a short Introduction, in which the traditional ascription of all the epistles to the Fourth Evangelist and his identification with the Apostle John is maintained, and in which a valuable section on the theology of the epistles finds a place, followed by the commentary. The French text and the commentary alternate, and the latter is fuller than the size of the series might suggest. The author is a well-known scholar, and this revision of a work

[1] *Die Theologie der hellenistisch-jüdischen Missionsliteratur unter Ausschluss von Philo und Josephus* (*Theologische Forschung*, No. 4) [1954]. Herbert Reich Evangelischer Verlag, Hamburg ; DM 9.80.

[2] *Bijbels Woordenboek*, 2nd ed., part i. [1954]. Romen and Zonen, Roermond ; Pl. 10,75.

[3] *Commentaar op de Heilige Schrift*, Fasc. 14–15 [1954]. H. J. Paris, Amsterdam ; Fl. 3 per part.

[4] Cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxvii. [December 1955], 94.

[5] *Le problème synoptique* [1954]. Desclée et Cie, Paris.

[6] *Épîtres de Saint Jean* [1954]. (Verbum Salutis, IX.) Beauchesne, Paris.

first published in 1936, takes account of more recent work. The *comma johanneum*, whose authenticity Leo XIII in 1897 forbade Roman Catholics to deny, is here recognized to be unauthentic, in the exercise of the freedom which was restored by the Holy Office in 1927.

The other volume is an Introduction to the Four Gospels, originally written by J. Huby, but completely revised by X. Léon-Dufour.[1] This is an up-to-date study which opens with a chapter on 'The Gospel before the Gospels' in which the Synoptic Problem is briefly reviewed. The common critical view of the priority of Mark, and the source Q behind Matthew and Luke, is stated, and also the variant view advanced in the Jerusalem Bible, while the views of Streeter and Vaganay also find mention. The author favours the view that the Aramaic Matthew was the earliest Gospel, but that when it was translated into Greek use was made of Mark. He has chapters on each of the Gospels separately, dealing briefly with their authorship and at greater length with their characteristics. There is a short excursus on Form Criticism, whose value is recognized without the endorsement of all the views of Form Critics, and one on the supposed martyrdom of the Apostle John. The Fourth Gospel is ascribed to the Apostle.

[1] *L'Évangile et les Évangiles* [1954]. (Verbum Salutis, XI.)

Deutero-Isaiah's Use of Pentateuchal Traditions. From the University of Groningen comes a doctoral dissertation written in Afrikaans, with a good summary in English, written by B. J. van der Merwe, and devoted to the subject of the traditions of the period covered by the Pentateuch, as they appear in the work of Deutero-Isaiah.[2] The author studies in turn the references to Creation, to the Garden of Eden, to the Flood, to the Patriarchs, and to the Mosaic period. He finds some links of content and of vocabulary with the parts of the Pentateuch commonly held to have reached their present form later than the time of Deutero-Isaiah, but shows that these are not sufficient to prove direct dependence. At the same time he demonstrates that the links with the sources held to be older than Deutero-Isaiah no more prove direct dependence here. In short, while the author could count on his hearers' knowledge of the substance of the traditions, he uses them with freedom and independence. He is not a historian, but a theologian and a preacher, and his use of the traditions is governed by the immediate and practical use he wishes to make of them. Into the thesis much careful and detailed work has gone, and the thoroughness and complete objectivity of the study may be commended.

[2] *Pentateuchtradisies in die Prediking van Deutero-jesaja* [1955]. J. B. Wolters, Groningen; Fl. 12.50.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Kinked Cups

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'For every man shall bear his own burden.'—Gal 6[5].

'Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ.'—Gal 6[2].

There's no mistake. It's kinked cups I want to talk about, not kingcups, which are quite different. The other day I was taken round a pottery (which is a 'pot-bank' to people who live in Stoke-on-Trent). I learned a great deal about one of the oldest crafts in the world.

Clay is strange stuff in the potter's hands. No wonder the Bible draws so many lessons from it. I watched women skilfully 'throwing' cups: that is the proper term for shaping them in soft clay. They told me that you must handle the shaped cup with immense care, because if you happen to press it out of shape ever so slightly, the damage cannot be put right. You may correct the fault in the soft clay, but when it is 'fired' in the huge oven, that kink will appear again.

That was the first lesson I learned. Folk are influenced for good or ill by the careless things we do or say. We cannot call back a single word we speak or withdraw a single action we perform. We may be forgiven, but the influence can never be removed.

They tell a story about Josiah Wedgwood, the greatest potter of them all. Once a Count came to see his wonderful works. A boy took him round the factory and explained the processes. Wedgwood followed for a while, but he was appalled at the way the Count swore and laughed at sacred things in the boy's presence. When he came back to the office, Wedgwood had a lovely vase to show him. The Count thought it was exquisite and said that he must buy it. The great potter shrugged his shoulders and said, 'All right, here it is.' But as he passed it to the nobleman he deliberately let it drop. It clattered to the floor in a thousand pieces. The Count was mad with rage that the thing he wanted had been wantonly smashed. When he had calmed a little, Wedgwood said: 'I can make you another vase like the one you have seen. But you can never make the heart of that boy pure again, which you have sullied with your filthy talk.'

But I learned a second lesson at the pot-bank. They told me that the weight of the handle which is stuck on to the cup in the wet clay is enough to pull it slightly out of shape during its firing. So do you know what they do? They place two cups together with their lips touching and send them to the kiln like that. It takes up a little more room, but one holds the other in place, and then there are no kinks.

It almost looks as though cups are like us. By ourselves we often go awry. But the encouragement of a true friend has often kept a lad straight. And the companionship of Jesus is the one sure defence in the fires of temptation.

When Paul wrote to the Galatians, he made within a few short verses the two seemingly contradictory statements of our texts. But I came to see the other morning that they are both true. We are each responsible for our own actions. We can blame no one else for them—neither those we mix with nor our ancestors before us. The fiery testing of growing up shows us to be what we really are. But it is also true that, if we take another with us into the testing furnace of life, we may stand as God meant us to stand. If that Other is Christ, the victory is sure.

The Footfall

By the Reverend J. Ithel Jones, M.A., B.D., London

'The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in from this time forth, and even for evermore.'—Ps 121[8].

I think every boy and girl knows the name of Wilfred Pickles. Occasionally I listen to his rollicking programme, 'Have a Go!' You know what happens. Wilfred visits different parts of the country, gathers a crowd in the Village Hall and brings different people to the microphone to answer questions and have a pleasant little chat. Among the questions he puts is this rather lovely one—'Is there something that costs you nothing but always gives you a lot of pleasure—something simple like the smell of new-mown hay or burning wood?'

Now one day Wilfred was inviting them to 'have a go' at a village in Kent where most of the men are miners who go down into the depths of the earth at peril of their lives to bring us coal to warm our homes, drive our trains and run our industries. Before the microphone was the wife of one of these miners, and when Wilfred asked about the simple thing that always gave her a glow of pleasure for which she never had to pay she replied, 'The sound of my husband's footsteps on the path as he comes home from the pit; for I know it's another safe return.'

A miner's footfall on a stone path and another safe return! We don't know the thrill of that because we don't know the dangers of a miner's life and yet I think even we, each time we return to rest, should thank God for His care and protection through yet another day. One of our hymns starts—

> Father, in high heaven dwelling,
> May our evening song be telling
> Of Thy mercy large and free;
> Through the day Thy love has fed us,
> Through the day Thy care has led us,
> With divinest charity.

And it's true. The Psalmist knew the truth of it when he said, 'The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in from this time forth, and even for evermore.'

The Christian Year

Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity

The Objective Side of Christianity

By the Reverend John L. Riach, B.D., Edinburgh

'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God.'—Mt 4[10].

'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel.'—Mk 16[15].

'Husbands, love your wives.'—Eph 5[25].

In *The Church Hymnary* there are two distinct types of hymn to be found. On the one hand, there are those which are subjective, where the author's eyes are turned inward on himself. An excellent example of that is Cowper's 'O for a closer walk with God,' especially the third and fourth verses. His own spiritual condition is his sole concern from the beginning to end of the poem. On the other hand, there are hymns in our book of praise which are entirely objective. The author has forgotten himself, and has turned his eyes outward on some being or thing outside himself. The hymn, 'O worship the King,' is a noble illustration of this. God in all His majesty and power takes up the entire attention of the writer.

A study of the Christian Faith reveals that it has its subjective and objective sides; but it is the latter that is often ignored by Christian people—especially the aspects of it pointed out in these three verses.

First, when Jesus said, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God,' we are called to be objective in worship. It was Emerson who once declared that we go primarily to Church to see how it stands with us. But, should we? That, alas, is the

attitude of multitudes of churchgoers. Up to the house of God they go with their attention fixed on some personal need, hoping against hope that it will be met through the service, and time and again they come away disappointed: and, little wonder. Their attitude to worship is subjective instead of objective. They have not learned the art of forgetting themselves when they enter the sanctuary, of riveting their eyes upon God alone, and pouring out their whole being in adoration of Him. The paradox is that when we engage in such self-forgetting, objective worship God goes quietly to work and we leave the holy place with our needs mysteriously met. Ours is the experience of the ten lepers. Instead of stretching forth His hands, which He usually used in all His acts of healing, Jesus told these unfortunates to take their eyes off their dread disease which had become an obsession with them, fix them on God, and go up to worship Him. As they went, in obedience to His instruction, they found the leprosy had disappeared. It is objective worship which cures the ills of us men. This is what that sufferer, the late Bishop Chavasse, was driving at when he said to people driven to distraction with their problems, burdens and sorrows, 'Praise is the great healer.'

Second, when Jesus said, 'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel,' we are called to be objective regarding the Church. Anthony Trollope was a bluff, self-enjoying individual. One day, when asked why he did not go to the Church about which he wrote so much in his novels, he declared that it was because he was forced to stay away. The faults of the Church were, to him, completely reprehensible. God knows, the sins to the Church's charge in our time are legion. Who can deny the hypocrisy, the nominalism, the prayerlessness, the ignorance of the Faith with which it is riddled to-day? The important question is, however, How can these appalling shortcomings be rectified? R. L. Stevenson warned us we should never dwell on our misconduct. The conscience has morbid sensibilities, and, while it must be used, it should never be indulged in. The Church will be made to see the enormity of her shortcomings and to shed them when she becomes objective; when she casts her eyes on the masses outside her borders and goes forth in mission to redeem them. This is what the 'Tell Scotland' movement has brought home to many a congregation. The visitation of churchless people in its parish mission may not have added many members to its roll, but it has changed the character of the congregation. The going forth to redeem others has made members realise that ignorance of the faith, unconcern for others, the lack of prayer, hypocrisy cannot be tolerated, and, by the grace of God, they are humbly seeking to rid themselves and the Church of these things. In the 'Tell Scotland' prayer card these words occur: 'By the presence of the multitude that are as sheep without a shepherd; by the sight of the human harvest unreaped in this land; move our hearts till they burn within us. Then, for our thankfulness, send us at Thy bidding into our cities to seek those whom we have scorned or forgotten. . . .' When the Church becomes objective like that, that is how the scandalous faults of the Church of our day will begin to disappear and she will cease to merit Swinburne's caustic phrase—'the leprous bride of Christ.'

Third, when Paul said, 'Husbands, love your wives,' we are called to be objective in the matter of marriage. Marshall Hall, the famous advocate, believed that married happiness was the greatest boon anyone could enjoy on this earth. In these days, married bliss appears to be at a premium. 'What has happened to modern pairs?' wrote Katherine Mansfield to a fellow novelist. She was tired of reading sordid stories about broken and unhappy marriages. If it be the case that married unhappiness is all too common these days what is the cause? Is it not essentially that both parties of such a union are subjective in their love instead of objective, or that one or other is? The late Sir Harry Lauder used to entertain his audiences throughout the world with a song which ran:

> If ever I marry again: If ever I marry again,
> She must be just about twenty-three,
> Fresh as a daisy and crazy for me:
> With tons and tons of money,
> And never say me 'nay,'
> And I must be the boss of the hoose
> If ever I marry again.

No wonder his hearers laughed. The picture of married life held up was completely ludicrous in the extreme as it was meant to be if it was to amuse. See how the singer is concerned only about what he wishes to receive from his wife. His love is ego-centric and subjective, not objective. That is the kind of love which makes havoc of any marriage if it is indulged in by one or both parties. For, what does it mean to fall in love? If a boy meets a girl and says to himself that if he marries her she will love him, make him comfortable and happy, he has not fallen in love with the girl. He has fallen in love with himself. If, instead, he says to himself that he must marry that girl for he longs to pour out all his love and affection upon her and do everything he can to make her happy, then he has really fallen in love with the girl. True love is not subjective but objective. Whatever the

outside world does, we in the Christian Church are called to such objective married love by Paul in this passage to Ephesians, which is read at the marriage service.

The Aga Khan tells us in his memoirs that if life has taught him anything it is that the secret of all happiness is to be objective ; to be concerned about beings and things outside himself. Long before the Aga Khan discovered this it was taught to the world by the Christian Faith. Particularly do men of our day need to learn the lesson in objectivity that Christianity has to teach concerning worship, the Church, and marriage in the three verses we have chosen from Holy Scripture.

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Essential Christianity

BY THE REVEREND OWEN E. EVANS, M.A., B.D., MANCHESTER

'Faith working through love.'—Gal 5^6 (R.V.).

'Once we are in Christ,' runs Knox's happy rendering of this verse, '. . . the faith that finds its expression in love is all that matters.' I do not think there exists a better short definition of the essential nature of the Christian life than that contained in this brief statement of Paul's which links together two of the most important words in the vocabulary of the New Testament and shows precisely the relationship in which the concepts represented by those two words stand to one another. In this sermon I propose first to examine briefly the meaning of the words 'faith' and 'love' and, secondly, to show how completely inter-dependent, in the Christian life, are the concepts which they represent.

1. (*a*) *Faith*, for Paul, is the word that sums up the essence of what Christianity means in its purely religious aspect ; it is the word that defines the Christian's attitude towards God. Faith is man's response to the grace of God made manifest in Jesus Christ, and it is the one and only condition upon which a man may receive the salvation made available in Christ. This faith is an activity of the whole personality ; it involves not only the assent of the mind to the fundamental propositions of Christian doctrine, but also the complete trust of the heart and the obedience of the will. Faith is complete self-surrender—committing oneself with one's whole being to the God who has revealed Himself in Christ. This reasoned, reliant, obedient self-committal is the right and proper attitude of the Christian towards God, and it is what Paul means when he uses the word 'faith.'

(*b*) *Love*, on the other hand, is for Paul the word that sums up the essence of what Christianity means in its ethical aspect ; it is the word that defines the Christian's attitude towards his fellow-men. For the Jews, morality was a matter of strict obedience to innumerable rules and regulations for conduct. When Paul, who had been brought up in that tradition, became a Christian, his view of the nature of morality underwent a great change. He came to realize that the Christian is 'not under law, but under grace'—that he serves God not according to the 'oldness of the letter' but 'in newness of the spirit.' In other words, morality for the Christian is a much less legalistic and a much more spiritual affair than it is for the Jew ; it is a matter, not so much of literal obedience to a complex system of rules and precepts, as of displaying, in every part of one's life and conduct, a particular and positive spiritual principle. And the word that defines that principle is the word 'love.' 'For the whole law,' says Paul later in the chapter, 'is fulfilled in one word, even in this ; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.'

2. Now the distinctively Christian life depends for its very existence upon the maintenance of a perfect balance between these two attitudes of faith towards God and love towards men. When faith loses sight of love, it ceases to be faith in the full Christian sense, and when love loses sight of faith it ceases to be Christian love. Christian faith and Christian love cannot exist apart from one another—they depend for their very life upon each other.

(*a*) *Faith depends upon love* because, as the text tells us, it is in love that faith finds its expression. And unless faith finds such a means of practical self-expression, it will wither and die. Just as one loses the use of physical and mental faculties through prolonged failure to employ them, so the spiritual faculty can only be preserved through being constantly practised. When James wrote that 'faith apart from works is dead,' he was not setting forth a doctrine of salvation by works in opposition to the Pauline doctrine of salvation by faith, but merely emphasizing this vital truth that unless faith is given expression in practical terms it dies. Unless a man's religion finds an outlet in his practical, everyday relationships with his fellow-men, it degenerates into mere religiosity ; godliness loses its power and becomes an empty form. James was no doubt having to combat an early outbreak of *antinomianism*—the heresy that has always been the besetting temptation of evangelical Christianity. There were those in the Early Church who needed to be warned against this heresy, but Paul was not one of them. 'Do we then make the law of none effect through faith ?' he asks, and in immediate reply cries out

in horror, 'God forbid: nay, we establish the law.' Paul knew as well as James that unless a man's faith is active in good works—unless it expresses itself in a life governed by the principle of love—it is barren and dead. 'If I have the gift of prophecy, and know all mysteries and all knowledge'—all the intellectual equipment and all the external paraphernalia of the religious life—'and if I have all *faith*, so as to remove mountains, *but have not love*, I am nothing.'

Yes, love is necessary to faith, for without it, as a practical medium of self-expression, faith in the distinctively Christian sense cannot survive.

(*b*) It is, however, no less true or important that *love depends upon faith*. It is common knowledge nowadays that the word which the New Testament uses in speaking of the supreme virtue of the Christian character is a different word from that commonly used in Greek for the natural affections that belong to the sphere of human relationships in this world. This word *agape*, as used in the New Testament, denotes a love that is entirely unselfish, a love that does not depend at all upon any worth or desirability in the character of its object; it is 'love to the loveless shown.' Now love like that is not a natural human quality; it is not something that belongs by nature to man's emotional make-up. It is a supernatural Divine quality. 'Love,' says St. John, 'is of God'; indeed it is the very essence of God's own nature: 'God is love.' The primary use of the word *agape* in the New Testament is for the love which God has for men. Were it not for their experience of that Divine love, men would never have conceived the possibility of such a love. And so it follows that before this quality of *agape* can appear in a man's life, his life must be in touch with God. He must be brought into a living personal relationship with God. 'Love is of God; and every one that loveth is begotten of God, and knoweth God.' But how can we be brought into this living personal relationship with God? The answer, of course, is—by faith. Faith brings us into such a living communion with God that the love which is the essence of His Divine nature is able to flow into our lives. 'The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us,' and that love becomes the governing principle of our every thought and word and action.

Faith, then, is necessary to love, for without it, as the response that links our lives with the Divine resources of God Himself, love in the distinctively Christian sense can never be ours.

Such is the Christian life. *Faith*—a living personal relationship with God, a relationship nurtured and cultivated, and ever deepened and enriched by constant and devoted attention to the means of grace that are always available to us—finding its expression in *love*, in relationships with our fellow-men that are determined and governed by the perfect law of unselfish, sacrificial love. The love dependent upon the faith for its very possibility of being manifested in us; and the faith dependent upon the love for its very possibility of survival; and the two, in perfect balance and indissoluble union, constituting the distinctive character of the Christian life. If, by the grace of God, those of us who claim to be 'in Christ' can exemplify this quality of life, then that is indeed (to quote again the rendering of Knox) 'all that matters.'

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Root of our Malady

BY THE REVEREND D. H. C. READ, M.A., D.D.,
NEW YORK

'When Jesus saw their faith, he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee.'—Mk 2^5.

'Thy sins be forgiven thee.' That was not what he expected. Even if the paralytic had been taught by his religion that there was an intimate connexion between sin and sickness he would expect Jesus to deal first with the paralysed limbs that condemned him to the perpetual twilight of the bedridden.

'Son, thy sins be forgiven thee'—is that what we expect from Jesus Christ? When we think of the paralysed limbs of modern society; the magnificent human material rotting through bad conditions, fears and neuroses; the inventive genius of mankind deflected to the preparation of war; the free intercourse of trade and ideas between nations dammed by restrictions and controls—then it seems natural to ask of the Church of Christ in the first place a cure for the ills of the body politic. What we want from Jesus Christ is a programme for survival, a way out of the maze of fears and frustrations in which we live. I believe there is a salvation of this kind offered us in Christ, but only on condition that we listen *first* to the word that Christ Himself sets before all others—the word of forgiveness of sins.

There was a time when Christian preachers had to labour this point of human sin. To-day there is no Christian doctrine more congenial to the mind than Original Sin. I am not thinking of the neo-Christian poets and playwrights who have spoken to our generation: I am thinking of the unconscious testimony of a host of novelists, dramatists, journalists, artists and musicians, to the radical, uncontrollable twist in human nature that has brought us to the present impasse of

evil. The true artist, whether or not he is a Christian, cannot help seeing into the abyss into which the world is falling. And as he sees, as he feels, so he writes and paints—and our uncles and aunts turn away in disgust, saying : ' Depressing ! Horrible ! I don't understand. I want a nice book. I like a nice picture.'

The story is told of a Nazi officer during the War entering the studio of Picasso in Paris. As he gazed around the canvasses with their contorted bodies, sinister shapes, and confused patterns, he shouted : ' Who is responsible for all this ? ' And the painter answered simply : ' You are.'

Conviction of sin used to be a theme for preachers. To-day, whatever they may call it themselves, it is the message of the artist, for it is a reflection of the world that he sees. The Rumanian novel, *The Twenty-fifth Hour*, which depicts our era as the dying struggle of individual Man against the technology he has created, and shows us the fate of a simple peasant caught up in the conflict and spending twelve years in one prison camp after another—Nazi, Russian, American—for no reason at all, is a moving conviction of sin—the sin that has smashed the image of God in man and made him the plaything of mechanistic powers.

For this is what the artist is reflecting, consciously or unconsciously ; this is the root of our malady. We are in confusion because we are adrift from God. ' O Lord, to us belongeth confusion of face . . . because we have sinned against thee.' That is the conviction that stares at us even from the works of those who acknowledge no God. ' We have sinned '—not ' they ' but ' we,' all of us, in breaking the one relationship on which all else depends.

It is only when the conviction of sin gets the length of this recognition that we can hear the word that Jesus Christ speaks to man—His first and greatest word. So long as we interpret the evil in the world and in ourselves solely in economic, sociological, or psychological terms, we cannot see any way through. For all therapeutic treatments of individual or society, however successful, depend in the end on the integrity of those who apply them. And there is no man, or group of men, so perfect as to be entrusted with our salvation. But if the root of all evil is our offence against God, then it may be that God Himself can offer the restoration, the reconciliation which is our only ground of hope. That is why the first and last and greatest word of the Bible remains this declaration of Jesus Christ : ' Son, thy sins be forgiven thee.'

It is this note of forgiveness, of reconciliation, that marks off the Christian outlook on the world from that of current fatalism and despair. And it is just this note that is lacking in the creative work of many of our most sensitive artists. Forgiveness of sins is the basis of Christian hope ; it is the foundation of all Christian action ; it is the guarantee of the continual possibility of new beginnings, a fresh start for us all.

I believe that our main difficulty with this belief is to get behind the curtain of words to the fact. ' I believe in the forgiveness of sins. . . .' What do the words mean ? Just what do you say you believe in ? Do you mean continually and automatically God is content to ignore all men's sins ? Is this just an easy theory about God—as Voltaire put it—' Dieu ? Pardonner, c'est son métier ? ' If forgiveness is a matter of course, an axiom of religious thought, mere words, then it has little relation to the moral struggle, the battle of good and evil in which we are all engaged.

Jesus knew perfectly well that talk about the forgiveness of sins could be just that—mere talk. ' Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins be forgiven thee ; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk ? ' Here is a man disabled in body and spirit. To say ' Take up thy bed and walk ' would be a tremendous word—for immediately every one present would see whether or not it was an empty or an effective word. But to say, ' Son, thy sins be forgiven thee '—well, any one could say that, and no one would be any the wiser as to whether, in fact, anything at all had happened. That is precisely the dilemma of the Church. The words about God's forgiveness seem to remain mere words. But notice that Jesus raises this point here precisely because He is going to speak the other word, the word whose effectiveness they can all check. ' Arise, and take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house.' What I believe our Lord to be saying to us here is that the word of forgiveness, the hidden word that cannot be verified by human eyes, is just as real and just as effective as a word that operates a spectacular healing of the body. When He says, ' son, thy sins be forgiven thee ' *something happens*, something which He clearly regards as the most important of all.

If we take the words of Jesus Christ seriously, then a miracle is happening in every church throughout the world where true confession is made and forgiveness received. Forgiveness is a miracle. It is not a philosophical truism, or a religious platitude. If we are to believe the New Testament Christ came into the world not simply to announce God's forgiveness of sins, but to effect it, to convey it. If forgiveness was automatic there would have been no point in His saying to any one ' thy sins *be* forgiven thee.' If forgiveness was a truism He would not have spent Himself to the death of the Cross to convey God's grace to men. Listen again to His words : ' But that ye

may *know* that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins.' Do we know it? The Christ whom we preach is the one with power to convey the full forgiveness of God. He is the living link between the holiness of God and our poor, twisted humanity. To receive from Him pardon for our sins is a miracle, the miracle of rebirth in the image of God.

But, just as there is nothing automatic about the conveying of forgiveness, so there is nothing automatic about its reception. The words 'Son, thy sins be forgiven thee' can fall like raindrops on a slab of concrete. The conditions for receiving God's forgiveness are simply the desire for a right relationship to Him, and for a right relationship to our fellows. The word of forgiveness effects nothing when there is no desire to be forgiven. And it likewise effects nothing when there is no desire to forgive. 'Forgive us our trespasses' we pray time after time, 'as we forgive them that trespass against us.' Receiving the forgiveness of God means entering on a new kind of life, the life of His Kingdom where hardness, bitterness, hatred have no place. Our Lord told a story of a man who owed three million pounds, and was let off scot-free. He then went and threatened another man who owed him twenty. That is the way He sees it. Perhaps the word of forgiveness, spoken in Christ's name by the Church, will only have power again in the land when it is more clearly linked to an effective action among the paralysed limbs of our society. Then when men see Christian power in action they will be able to realise that the greatest and most practical of all the Church's actions is the declaration of the gospel of forgiveness of sins.

Here, then, is where we begin. This is an inescapably personal thing. No matter what our aspirations are for the helping of our tangled humanity, no matter what social embodiment of the Christian faith we hope to work for; this is where we must begin. The most practical, hopeful, useful step that we can take is to pause in the presence of God, just as we are, with all our imperfections upon us, and hear this word of Christ, this miraculous, supernatural word: 'Son, thy sins be forgiven thee.'

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Can We Be Sure?

BY THE REVEREND HAROLD G. NEWSHAM, M.A., HARTFORD, CONN., U.S.A.

'If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly.'—Jn 10^{24} (R.V.).

Mr. Gilbert Highet, of Columbia University, said recently 'Nothing is so wearisome and boring to an intelligent person as arguments on questions of fact which could be settled immediately by looking up the answer in an authoritative reference book.' By way of illustrating his meaning he said he once overheard a discussion in the lounge of a trans-Atlantic liner, which endured for over an hour, as to the month of the year when the American Civil War ended. This, unless the ship's library was devoid of the most elementary encyclopaedia, could have been decided right away.

1. Is Yale in New Haven or in New York? That is not a matter for argument. It is a matter of fact. The question can be settled by appeal to any competent, recognised authority—whether a book or a person.

Is Saturn or Neptune nearer the earth? If I have forgotten the mnemonic most of us learned at school, the only sensible thing is to look the matter up in a reference book which will give the unanimous reply of reputable authorities. I may not like the answer they give. It may not be the answer I gave in an exam. paper! But my likes or dislikes, my ideas and opinions are entirely beside the point.

Is Bach's *Jesu, Joy of man's desiring* an inspired piece of religious music, beside which many more popularly acclaimed compositions are inferior and juke-box? Ah, here we enter a different field. Many with acknowledged right to an opinion on such matters have no more doubt about it than they have that Yale is in New Haven. But how can we be sure, supposing we want to be sure? Well, we will be wise to begin by admitting that if there is such a consensus of judgment by those with the right to speak on such matters, then we ought somehow to qualify ourselves more adequately in this field. On the other hand, no authorities in the world can really tell us anything that is significant until we ourselves come to experience the sublimity of the one and the ordinariness of the other.

Was Jesus really Divine? Did He really rise from the dead? Is it true that 'warm, sweet, tender, even yet, a present help is He'? How can we be sure? Aren't there some authorities somewhere whose answer to those questions we ought to accept?

2. Well, now, this very question is actually raised in the Bible itself. And it is raised, as we say nowadays, at the top level. Twice the question was asked of Jesus Himself—'Tell us simply and plainly, "Are you, or aren't you, the Christ?"' Once it was asked by some who were, probably, a mixed bunch. Some were sincere, genuinely wanting to know what He would answer. Others wanted only something that could be used in evidence against Him. Jesus declined to give any such simple and direct answer. Instead He re-

ferred them to His teaching as a whole, to His deeds and entire manner of life, and then sent the question down again to the court of their own judgment for a verdict.

It was precisely the same when John the Baptist asked Him the same question. John, faithful follower that he was, found himself deeply troubled. His earlier certainties about Jesus had become clouded. You would say that if ever there was a moment when Jesus might have returned the simple, direct answer 'Yes, I am,' this was it. Instead, He did exactly what He did when that crowd of persistent questioners asked Him. He reminded John of His words and works, and then returned the question to the court of John's own judgment for a verdict.

3. It would seem clear that our hankerings, our desires and requests for plain, straightforward and authoritative answers to our religious questions and perplexities would not commend themselves to Jesus. To be sure if any one ever spoke with an authority, which no sensitive ear can miss, it was He. Whether He is speaking about the nature and character of God, or on the purpose and destiny of human life, or on the essence of good and evil, or on the genuine and the spurious in religion, Jesus speaks with unmistakable authority.

But the very distinctiveness of this authority is due precisely to its difference from what we usually mean by authority. We usually mean by authority these courts of reference, these scholars who can settle the matter once and for all, these reference books that have all the answers. And we usually mean by authority that which is entitled to the unhesitating submission of all sensible people to its 'say sos.' Such an authority asserts 'Here is the last word on the subject. You'd be wise just to let it go at that and accept what we say.'

But the authoritativeness of Jesus is not like that—not a bit like that. He never says 'Here is something I am going to disclose to you about God, or about your duty here and now, or about the life to come, and you must simply believe it because I who have unique sources of information tell you that it is so.'

On the contrary, 'Though He speaks,' as it has been finely said, 'calmly, assuredly, above the region of cloud and storm, like one descending from the open heavens and exhaling upon the earth the pure atmosphere of a serener world,' nevertheless Jesus never speaks dogmatically, but always persuasively. His appeal is not to His own prestige and position, but to the response within our own hearts and minds evoked by His words and works and life. 'How think you?' is His constant question.

4. It is, perhaps, the sure sign of having left infancy and childhood behind and of having come to a mature selfhood when we not only recognize, but are grateful that there are no absolute certainties in the life of the spirit and no absolute authorities on whose 'say so' we can just lie back and let it go at that. The authority of Jesus is an inward one. It patiently waits for my 'yes.' It invites me to read, mark and inwardly digest His words. It asks me to consider His acts, and especially His Cross. It desires me to give heed to the effect awakened within me by His life of complete dedication to God. It urges me to take into the reckoning the effect of His life upon the quality of men's living through nineteen centuries of time and in every place where the story of that life has been told. And then the questions that matter most are thrust back upon our own deepest insights and upon our courage to back these insights with our lives and fortunes and follow the light we have whithersoever it may lead, and in the following of that light find ourselves in ever clearer light until the day dawns and the shadows flee away.

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Meet Distress, Meet Duty

BY THE REVEREND JAMES MUNN, M.A., GLASGOW

'A certain Samaritan . . . went to him.'—Lk $10^{33.\ 34}$.

Jesus was being asked 'What is your definition of a neighbour? And what do you mean by duty? And where should we draw the line?' Well He knew how human nature can juggle with definitions, can wriggle through the closest meshes of legislation, and drive a coach and four through regulations. So Jesus would draw no line of demarcation; He refused to narrow the field. Instead He pictured a man with no hard and fast conceptions of duty, a man immortal as a true gentleman when others of whom much was expected miserably failed. The Samaritan rose to this situation because he met three challenges.

1. *He met the challenge of an obvious need.* No man can contract out from the tragedy and pain of life—at least, he cannot contract out and remain a man of honour. Somewhere along the road, whether he shuts his eyes or stops to help, he will stumble on victims of misfortune; and his finest endeavour can begin in such an encounter. Consider, for example, the Friendly Societies of our own country which were springing into existence a hundred and thirty years ago. What sort of age was that? It was the age of Wilberforce, crusading tirelessly against slavery. It was the age of Dickens, drawing back the grim curtain

from the prisons and slums of England, showing to a complacent public opinion the sorrows of its children and the tragedy of its poor. It was the age when starving country labourers in the south marched on London to win a wage of half-a-crown a day; and for this crime three were hanged and four hundred and twenty transported to Australia as convicts. In the shocking and bitter need of such a time the Friendly Societies rose up to dispense relief and security and friendship and hope.

To-day's need, still plain and sharp, has a call not so much to society or system, to committee or State, as to *persons* for personal interest and personal action. The coloured man who is not understood, the man from prison looking for a chance to make his come-back as a decent workman, the aged who are frail and friendless—all these are in our community, perhaps uncomfortably near. But we have not dealt with the situation when we have reported their need to some organisation or remitted it to an official. Lying at the wayside on the Jericho Road was a man in dire straits, but that was not an occasion for some Hospital Relief Association; it was a plain case for some one's hand, some one's pity, some one's action.

No honest citizen ever lives above that challenge. This is part of the price we pay, or ought to pay, for our place in the community. This is no old story. We also are on this Jericho Road to-day.

2. *The Samaritan met the challenge of the indifference of others.* Indifference is a spineless business. It gets no marks, for it takes up no positive attitude for or against anything. In the parable the situation was saved because, while two men were not interested at all, a third cared enough to get down in to the ditch.

It is an alarming and dangerous sign, in an individual or in an age, when men 'couldn't care less.' We cry out about this when election results show how few have bothered to record their vote. We read in our newspapers of disasters abroad, of famine, flood or earthquake, yet we turn with quickened interest to our football results and our page of society gossip. We plan and pray for economic recovery for the country, but we are not above making a little on the side or demanding more income for less work.

Indifference does not recognise an ideal even if it sees one; it rejects the authority of any sanction higher than its own comfort; it means the freeze up of principles and moral scruples. Calvin Coolidge, it is reported, returned silent from Church. 'What was your sermon about to-day,' they asked him. 'Sin,' he answered. 'And what had the preacher to say about sin?' 'He was against it.' Indifference is not even against sin; it just is not interested. Our danger to-day is not that we go out for the bad, but that we lose notion of the good and so let great causes go by default.

> Or is the wise man wise indeed,
> Whom larger thoughts keep whole,
> Who sees life equal like a chart,
> Made strong to play the saner part,
> And keep his head and keep his heart,
> And only lose his soul?

We may be so afraid to lose our heart or our head over a cause that in the end we do nothing—and lose our soul. The indifference of the majority on a moral issue does not confer on us the right to go easy. If others have passed by a situation which calls for action, their very indifference is in itself a challenge to us.

3. *The Samaritan had to face the challenge of his own resources.* The man had means of transport and an ambulance outfit. He had money and credit and friends at hand. He had courage, strength and a kindly heart; and he was judged by the use he made of his resources.

No man can escape that test. Whatever talent you possess becomes your judge. Will you employ it for others, or invest it for self? Will you do as little as possible, or care magnificently for the unhappy and the unfortunate? A nation boasts its mighty armies, its fleets for air or sea; but will it use these to guard the peace of the world or to shatter it? A country is leaping forward as it develops its natural resources; but will it permit a racial minority to drudge along disfranchised? A man is adding to his income and social stature; but does he forget the humble and the handicapped and the holy kingdom of Christ? Where is the honour of a higher standard of living if it only means that a higher income goes on gambling, indulgence, pleasure, while moral issues are spurned? Before a man's final standing is fixed he must face the challenge of what he has done with what he has had. As our own pithy saying has it, 'It's no' what ye dae; and it's no' what ye hae; it's what ye dae wi' what ye hae.' For in the day of the Last Judgment Christ will say to some, 'Depart'; and here is His test. 'I was an hungred, . . . thirsty, . . . a stranger, . . . naked, . . . sick, and in prison. . . . Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.'

Contributions and Comments

Did Jesus Speak Greek?

In the July issue of The Expository times (lxvii. 317) the Rev. H. Mudie Draper comments upon my Note (lxvii. [December] 92) in which I argued that Jesus sometimes spoke Greek. Mr. Draper thinks my argument inconclusive and prefers to believe that Jesus did not speak Greek.

The manner in which he disposes of my evidence is not convincing to me. For instance, I drew attention to the fact that the words of our Lord in Mt 5^{39-40} echo Is $50^{6.\ 8}$ in the LXX, the Hebrew being very different. Mr. Draper replies: 'It is more than probable that when Matthew wrote 5^{39-40} he put the words of our Lord into a form with which he was quite familiar.' But this reply is not convincing. If Jesus based His saying upon the Hebrew version of Is $50^{6.\ 8}$ He can hardly have uttered the saying recorded by Matthew at all. If He did utter the saying (and there is no saying in the Gospels more characteristic of Him), then it is difficult to resist the conclusion that He knew the Greek of the LXX.

Mr. Draper claims that the Greek of the sayings of Jesus is Semitic Greek. This is true of some of His sayings, but not of all. For instance, at Mt 8^{12} $13^{19.\ 38}$ 24^{14} Jesus is represented as speaking of 'the Kingdom' without qualification, meaning the kingdom of heaven. But, according to Dalman (*The Words of Jesus*, 95), when 'the kingdom' is used in Jewish literature without further definition, it always means 'the secular government for the time being.' As Dalman concludes, therefore, the Greek here is definitely not Semitic.

Further, we find in sayings of Jesus at Mt 6^{3} $13^{6.\ 19.\ 21}$ $18^{24.\ 25}$ $25^{5.\ 10}$, Lk 6^{48} 12^{36} 14^{29} $15^{14.\ 20}$ $21^{26.\ 28}$ the use of the genitive absolute which is characteristic of Hellenistic Greek, but so rare in Semitic Greek. In the LXX the genitive absolute is extremely frequent in those books (*e.g.*, 2–4 Maccabees) which are not translated from Hebrew or Aramaic, and rare in those which are.

My critic maintains that Aramaic was widespread and popular even among Greek-speaking Gentiles 'in all that part of the world,' including Mesopotamia and Asia Minor. This seems to conflict with so eminent an authority as E. Schürer, according to whom Aramaic was not popular even with the Jews of the Dispersion. He says that in the Diaspora 'the *language* used in the synagogue was undoubtedly as a rule *Greek*' ('Diaspora' in *H.D.B.*, extra vol., 107a). It must be remembered that the Seventy translated the Old Testament into Greek, not Aramaic.

I have no doubt whatever that Jesus spoke Aramaic. I am merely concerned to urge that He probably also knew Greek and spoke in Greek to Greek-speaking Gentiles. Mr. Draper thinks that the Greeks of Galilee were bilingual. He may be right. But if they were, why should not the Jews of Galilee have been bilingual also?

A. W. Argyle

Oxford

Genesis xli. 40

וְעַל־פִּיךָ יִשַּׁק כָּל־עַמִּי : *καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ στόματί σου ὑπακούσεται πᾶς ὁ λαός μου*

The presence of יִשַּׁק in this verse causes some difficulty. Kittel suggests יָשֹׁק (שָׂקַק to run), which can be used metaphorically and applied to 'living,' just as 'conversation' means 'way' or 'manner of life': and so would read 'shall My people live.' The LXX has *ὑπακούσεται* (corresponding to יִקְּשֵׁב (Hiph. of קָשַׁב), and meaning in the Hiph. 'to give heed,' and so 'to obey' The Peshitta has יִשָּׁפֵט (Niph. of שָׁפַט), and means 'shall be judged.'

Both A.V. and R.V. have 'shall be ruled,' taking יִשַּׁק to mean 'to kiss (in homage).'

I suggest a simpler solution, needing no textual amendment, nor undue straining on the meaning of יִשַּׁק.

The ancient Egyptians had an idiom for 'to eat' which was 'to kiss one's food': quite an apt, as well as rather a beautiful, one.

Hence 'to kiss' here means 'to eat': in complete agreement with the foregoing context, where Joseph plans to store up much food during the plentiful years, and ration it out in the lean years.

Pharaoh, approving this, said, 'According to thy word, shall my people eat' ('kiss' in idiomatic Egyptian): that is, he appointed Joseph supreme 'rationer.'

I would further urge that this adoption of an Egyptian, which was not a Hebrew, idiom, is strong evidence for the Hebrews' lengthy sojourn in Egypt; that is, is strong evidence for the underlying true historicity of this narrative in Genesis.

Norman Adcock

Cockington,
Torquay, Devon

Entre Nous

The Happy Warrior

It might well be said that any man who has reached the age of eighty has a right to write his autobiography; and it is a double right when he has been a student of Trinity College, Dublin, a Chaplain in the First World War, in charge of the great parishes of West Ham and Birmingham, and a Chaplain to the Queen, and in addition to all that a great traveller on the face of the earth. *A Rebel at Heart,* by the Rev. Canon Guy Rogers (Longmans; 16s. 6d. net), is sub-titled *The Autobiography of a Nonconforming Churchman.* 'Self-revelation,' writes Canon Rogers, 'is a delicate matter at all times,' but there is in this book a charm and a sincerity which makes it delightful.

Canon Rogers is an Irishman, and therefore a man of strong opinions. He tells of a brilliant Irishman who denounced a certain Archbishop because 'he breakfasted on negotiation; lunched on compromise; and dined on surrender.' Canon Rogers studied in Trinity College, Dublin, in the days of the great J. P. Mahaffy, who, being asked if he was a clergyman, replied: 'Yes, but not in any offensive way.' Canon Rogers chose the Church as his career. He tells a kind of parable of two young men who came to say good-bye to their tutor at the end of their College days. They were going to see the world before settling down. The tutor asked one of them: 'What do you propose to do on your return?' 'I mean to take Holy Orders,' was the reply. 'And you?' he said to the other. 'Not Holy Orders,' was the answer. 'I fear I could not rise to that.' In due time they returned, and visited their tutor again. 'Well,' said the tutor to the first, 'what about it? Have you seen the world, and what is the result?' 'Yes, I have,' the first answered, 'but I cannot face the responsibility of Holy Orders any longer; things are too difficult.' 'And you?' said the tutor to the second. 'Yes,' said the second, 'I have seen the world, and I want to help. I've changed my mind, and thrown in my lot with Christ.'

After the First World War Canon Rogers went to West Ham. There he was right in the middle of the people. He tells of one very live and human problem. 'A fine young man who was standing firmly as a Christian in his factory found himself in a peculiar position. Every week there was a sweepstake in his shop, and, as a Christian, he thought it was his duty to keep out of it. So he did, but found that each week, such was the confidence that his mates had in him, they brought him the stakes to keep and hold. What should he do about it?' There, indeed, is a subject for debate! He tells of how the Socialist Mayor Jack Jones welcomed the Princess Royal at a function in West Ham: 'We may have our different views of the royalty of birth, but we are all agreed to-day in welcoming the royalty of worth.'

Canon Rogers has strong opinions and does not pull his punches. He believes that women should be ordained to the ministry. He nobly states his views on inter-communion: 'Christians should come together to the Lord's Table as members of the One Church, and no individual Church has the right to set up barriers to prevent them. There is one Lord and one Holy Table; not a number of different Tables nor a number of Lords of separate Churches. To refuse inter-communion is to live in sin.'

In everything Canon Rogers writes there is a warm humanity. He tells how at a Conference the speaker quoted from a letter sent to him by some one in trouble, a letter which ended with these words: 'For God's sake don't treat me as a *case.*' Canon Rogers would never do that. He quotes from one of his own sermons: 'What does Christian liberty mean to me? Liberty to disagree with the excellent sub-Christian articles which I read in the Press every morning; liberty to worship God in the way I find most helpful, undismayed by the traditions of the Church; liberty to associate with the wrong set of people, who, in the inscrutable providence of God have got hold of the right way of thinking; liberty to make experiments and risk defeat; liberty to change my mind; liberty to become human and escape from the parsonic bedside manner; liberty to laugh in Church; liberty to talk to any one I like about how splendid Christ is; liberty to give up trying to be like other people and to have the courage to be myself.'

Perhaps Canon Rogers' most endearing characteristic is his ability to laugh at himself. His greatest work was done in Birmingham and he tells with delight about the old lady who enjoyed worshipping in his Church: 'It just suits me but my son, who is well educated, prefers, you will understand, to go to Carr's Lane.'

This book is like a breath of Christian grace and cheerfulness, and to read it is to emerge with a new hope for the Church. WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.